

# Broken Government: A Call to Action

*And Other Essays*



By A. J. MacDonald, Jr.

# Broken Government: A Call to Action

*And Other Essays*

A. J. MacDonald, Jr.

*To All the Innocents Who Have Been Brutally  
Destroyed by Our Selfishness*

All quotations from the Bible are taken from the Revised Standard Version, Catholic Edition; Catholic Biblical Association (Great Britain): *The Holy Bible : Revised Standard Version, Catholic Edition, Translated from the Original Tongues, Being the Version Set Forth A.D. 1611, Old and New Testament Revised A.D. 1881-1885 and A.D. 1901 (Apocrypha Revised A.D. 1894), Compared With the Most Ancient Authorities and Revised A.D. 1952 (Apocrypha Revised A.D. 1957)*. New York: National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, 1997, c1994. *Broken Government: A Call to Action and Other Essays* © 2010 A. J. MacDonald, Jr. All Rights Reserved.

## Table of Contents

Broken Government: A Call to Action	6
George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton: Corruption, Cocaine, and Murder	16
Our Politicians in Washington Are Leading Us to (Literal) Destruction	22
Washington Politicians: A Brood of Vipers	26
Political Musings	32
Outlines of Revolution: America	38
Ideas and Solutions for America's Problems	44
Polarized Nation:	
Why We Must Unite and How We Can Accomplish It	48
Natural Law and the Right to Life	54
The Peril of Perverted Political Perceptions	58
America, Its Enemies, and God's Judgment	62
Israel Did Not Keep God's Covenant; That's Why the Land is Not Theirs.	66
America, Symbolism, and Revolution	70
U. S.-Backed Israeli Terrorism	74
Why Do People Follow Osama bin Laden and Join al Qaeda?	78
On Protesting Abortion	82
Hasn't a U. S. Airliner Already Been Brought Down	

By Terrorists?	88
Days of Deceit: 12/7 and 9/11	90
My Review of Peter Lance's Book: <i>Triple Cross</i> (Or "How Much Did the FBI Know <i>Before 9/11?</i> ")	94
Jesus and Violence	100
Terrorism, Internet Radicalization, and Freedom	104
Compassion and Imagination	106
Resources	110
Index	114

## Broken Government: A Call to Action

The government of the United States of America is broken—our next election will solve nothing. This paper is a follow-up to an earlier paper I wrote ([Political Musings](#), October 2009) in which I outlined the structure of revolution regarding large, powerful governmental orders (e.g., the U. S., Russia, China, Iran). In that paper I pointed out the fact that, due to the powers of these governmental orders and their police state tactics, it is impossible for the people to attempt a violent, revolutionary overthrow of these orders. This paper is a call to *non-violent action* which, regardless of what I've just said about *violent* revolutions, is the proper, first step in any revolutionary movement. That having been said, I believe that non-violent action is the only hope the people have to restore, reform, and fix the broken governments which now rule over them.

I also pointed out, in the same [paper](#), the importance of using traditional symbolic imagery in order for any revolutionary movement to be successful. This imagery, alone, is meaningless; it must symbolize the philosophical concepts upon which the governmental order was founded, which must also be the same philosophical concepts upon which the (successful) revolutionary movement is based and desires to see restored.

In the United States of America the fundamental philosophical concept upon which our liberties and freedoms rest is [natural law](#). This natural law foundation along with the natural law-based right of the people to resist their broken governments is the traditional basis upon which all of western civilization rests:

“[A]ccording to [Thomas \[Aquinas\]](#), he [the ruler] may not take private property beyond what public need requires, though strictly speaking property is an institution of Human rather than Natural law. Above all, the rulership of one man over another must not take away

the free moral agency of the subject. No man is bound to obedience in all respects and even the soul of the slave is free (a doctrine Aristotle would hardly have understood). It is for this reason that the resistance of tyranny is not only a right but a duty." (George H. Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, Third Edition (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1937, 1950, 1961; 1965) pp. 255-256)

This natural law principle is the philosophical anchor of American political theory. This is why the leftist/Marxist style sort of revolution could never be realized in the United States, as it has in other countries. As I've said [elsewhere](#), any successful revolution is the U. S. must be premised upon our individual right to private property and liberty and the premise itself is based upon *natural law*.

[The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King](#) was a believer in [natural law](#) and natural law was the philosophical basis of his successful, non-violent, social liberation movement. When Dr. King was jailed in Birmingham, Alabama, he wrote [a letter](#) to his fellow clergymen—those who disagreed with King's non-violent protest tactics—explaining to them why it was proper for Christians to disobey unjust laws. Dr. King told them:

"One may ask: "How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?" The answer lies in the fact that there are two types of laws: just and unjust. I would be the Brat to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only a legal but a moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. I would agree with [St. Augustine](#) that "an unjust law is no law at all."

Dr. King went on to ask:

"How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust? A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distort the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority."

Dr. King's non-violent revolutionary movement had a sound philosophical basis: the individual's right—by virtue of their humanity—

to private property and liberty, which has been the basis of Western civilization and law for centuries, and *this* is why the movement was ultimately *successful*. Any revolutionary movement for the liberty of the oppressed peoples in America, if it's to be successful, *must be based upon these two fundamental concepts*, which are themselves based upon natural law: *private property* and *individual liberty*.

As I've said [elsewhere](#), the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King was a dreamer; a dreamer who undoubtedly believed in natural law. In the U. S., [natural law](#) theory has slowly been replaced by the theories of [legal](#) and [legal realism](#). In short, natural law theorists believe that a moral standard is built into the natural world by the Creator and that humankind therefore has moral standards that are universal for all peoples and in all cultures. The advocates of legal realism and positive law believe that there are no moral standards built into the natural world and that humankind therefore has no universal moral standard that is valid for all peoples and in all cultures.

Thank God for someone like Dr. King, who held America's feet to the fires of its natural law-based legal documents: The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. In his "[I Have a Dream](#)" speech, Dr. King told Americans that:

"When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness . . . Let us not wallow in the valley of despair. I say to you today, my friends, that in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal."

Dr. King was absolutely correct; and the American people's non-violent movement to restore our government must be based upon our government's traditional documents: [the Declaration of Independence](#) and the [Constitution](#) which, themselves, are based (philosophically) upon natural law.

Listen to the Founders of the United States of America, in their own words, which are taken from the Declaration of Independence, and ask yourselves this question: "What philosophical and legal basis did they have for resisting—and ultimately replacing—the tyrannical, broken government of England?

“When in the Course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.”

Did you notice the philosophical and legal basis upon which the Founders based their revolution? The philosophical and legal basis they used to “dissolve the political bands”? The philosophical and legal basis of their revolution was to base that revolution upon “the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God”. The Declaration goes on to say that the people have been “endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness”. This is the philosophical and legal foundation upon which our rights, as American citizens, rest. Our rights—to life, liberty and happiness—are given to us by our Creator; not by our government (or by anyone else). And this philosophical and legal foundation is one of natural law.

The Founders went on to say “That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.”

Governments are instituted in order to protect the rights of the people and our government derives its authority from the people themselves. And when the government becomes *destructive*—rather than *protective*—of the people’s rights it is “the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form,

as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness".

We, as *the people*, have every right—a God-given right—to alter or abolish our government when it has become destructive of our rights and when it endangers our safety.

The question, now, is: does this "Broken Government: A Call to Action" meet the Founder's requirements, which are found in the Declaration of Independence?

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security."

The Founders (wisely) tell us that we should not change our government "for light and transient causes" because the people "are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed"; however, "when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security."

This is the condition in which we—the people of the United States of America—now find ourselves. We have suffered under a very long train of abuses and usurpation, the intent of our (federal) government being to reduce us under absolute despotism, and it is the right of the people—the *duty* of the people—to "right themselves", "to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security".

What we need in American today are New Guards who can insure our future security. These New Guards will be those who know, understand and respect the U. S. Constitution and they will be those who know, understand and respect the warning that was given to us by our Founding Father, George Washington, who said, "[It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign](#)" and by so doing will truly ensure the safety of the American people.

It "is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish [a government that has become destructive of the rights of the people and has jeopardized their safety], and to institute new Government, laying its

foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness".

So what is the “long train of abuses” under which we, the people, now suffer? My question is: where do we begin? If the Founders believed they were suffering then, under British rule, what in God’s name would they think of the tyrannical sufferings we now endure at the hands of the very government which they once instituted? I think they would be perplexed and dismayed that we had not, long ago, thrown off and righted ourselves. In short, they would be sorely disappointed with us for putting up with as much as we have put up with for so long now. Benjamin Franklin would no doubt remind us that, [“They who can give up essential liberty.”](#)

Gross [over-taxation](#), a federal government that has become [bloated](#) beyond all measure (including federal workers who are receiving [six-figure salaries, raises and bonuses](#) in the midst of the current recession/depression!), and, most importantly, the [abrogation](#) of our [constitutional rights](#), namely:

Our *First Amendment* rights: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting [the free exercise thereof](#); or abridging the [freedom of speech](#), or of the press; or the right of the people [peaceably to assemble](#), and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

Our *Fourth Amendment* rights: “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against [unreasonable searches](#) and seizures, shall not be violated, and [no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause](#), supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized”.

Our *Fifth Amendment* rights: “No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, [unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury](#), except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject [for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy](#) of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, [without due process of law](#); nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation”.

Our *Tenth Amendment* rights: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are [reserved to the States](#) respectively, or to the people”.

Our *Fourteenth Amendment* rights: “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are

citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property; nor to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws".

This brief overview consists of *only a few examples* of the various and sundry abridgements of our rights and liberties. The people of the United States of America have been suffering under this oppression of liberty for quite some time now. Our broken government, with its so-called "War on Terror", has unleashed an entirely new assault upon our liberties and freedoms and has raised these abuses and abridgements to an all time high in which no citizen can feel protected by law knowing that, if the government wishes to do so, they are at the mercy of a government that imagines itself to be at war with its citizens—all of whom are considered suspect, unless proven innocent—and imagines that the United States of America itself is a battlefield.

The current "War on Terror" situation is intolerable; it is the end of justice and the rule of law in America as we have known it—despite the (normal, everyday?!) infringements of our rights and liberties, many of which were enumerated above.

Since then-president Bush declared, after 9/11, that the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were "acts of war" rather than the "terrorist attacks" that they were, this nation has been destroying our rights, suspecting everyone, and is careening—like a drunk driver, with the America people in the back seat of the car—toward inevitable destruction at the hands of our (and Israel's) enemies (Iran, Russia, and China) in a haughty, misconceived plan to dominate the Middle East and control its oil reserves.

Let's be quite candid here and admit to ourselves that our government considers us all to be terrorists . . . until we can prove that we are not. Do you think I am exaggerating? Lets me ask you this: when any of us goes to the airport, are we not suspected to be terrorists? We've all heard the ridiculous stories of old women—American citizens—who were told to remove their shoes before they could board their flight; or, even worse: a four-year old child with leg braces whose father was told by the TSA that he had to remove his child's leg braces before they could board their flight.

In the name of the "War on Terror" we have seen the suspension of due process and the rule of law, kidnapping, torture, warrantless eavesdropping, spying, and even the authorized assassination of U. S.

Our government is broken and it "is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish [our government when it has become destructive of the rights of the people and jeopardized our safety], and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect [our] Safety and Happiness".

There is one—and only one—solution to our current ([crisis](#)) situation: the people must descend—[\*en masse\*](#)—upon Washington and engage in massive, non-violent anti-government protests until we get the major reforms, foreign policy course reversals, and the regime change (i.e., the current politicians of *both* political parties) that we so desperately need. Unfortunately, most of people I speak to about this tell me that Americans will *never* mobilize to engage in this sort of massive non-violent anti-government protest, which would be similar to the protests we've witnessed in [Czechoslovakia](#), [Ukraine](#), and—most recently—in [Iran](#), in order to fix our broken government. But this is the only way for us—the people—to ensure the restoration of our rights and our safety. Are we supposed to imagine that the Czechs, the Ukrainians, and the Iranians are more courageous than are the Americans? Is this true? Has it actually come to this? Have we really become that apathetic? If we have, then we certainly don't deserve to be free peoples; we deserve the continued diminishment of our rights and freedoms and we deserve to have our safety and our happiness further jeopardized.

But I refuse to believe this about the American people. I think the people have simply grown accustomed to having their rights diminished—very slowly but very surely—over time and that, as of now, the people simply fail to realize just how [\*dangerous\*](#) the current ([crisis](#)) situation actually is: the “leaders” of our broken government in Washington are fools who, in the name of the “War on Terror”, are leading us headlong into [\*World War III\*](#), which is a war that *we will not—and cannot—win*.

If the American people don't care about the loss of their rights and their freedoms will they perhaps care about the all-to-real possibility that they will lose their lives as the result of a nuclear attack by China?

The fact of the matter is that current U. S. foreign policy is not only *wrong-headed* it is *wrong*, or [\*morally evil\*](#). The U. S. is guilty of [war](#); crimes which violate the Geneva Convention and, since the U. S. supports Israel, the U. S. is also guilty of Israel's [war crimes](#) against the Palestinian peoples. Not to mention the fact that [NATO](#) (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), whose explicit purpose has always been *defensive*, is now—and has been, since [the war in Yugoslavia](#) during the 1990's—being used as an *offensive* force. This is an explicit—and dangerous—breach of the Russian peoples trust on the part of NATO. The Russians, for good reason, have always feared that we would renege on our agreement and use NATO as an offensive force, which we are now doing [in Afghanistan](#). The Russians were right to doubt the word of the United States and the rest of the NATO member states, *because we lied to them*.

Do the American people care about the many innocent peoples who are being killed and maimed and who are suffering the unimaginable losses of homes and loved ones at the hands of our military and NATO? These atrocities are being committed in *our* name. And if we, the people, fail to change our brutal government into a government that is compassionate, we will bear the guilt of our (nationally committed) crimes against humanity. Do the American people care enough to put a stop to it? To do what is right as opposed to what is wrong? To do that which is good as opposed to doing that which is evil?

I hope that we do because, if we don't, we are not worth saving; we deserve to be punished. And I can assure you that the Creator-God—from whom our rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness derive—will allow our enemies to triumph over us.

***“The resistance of tyranny is not only a right but a duty”***



# George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton: Corruption, Cocaine, and Murder

*One Example of the Criminal-Level Corruption That Exists in Washington, D. C.*

“If I didn’t have personal, first-hand experience with this I’d probably think it was just another one of those hare-brained conspiracy theories.”

A. J. MacDonald, Jr.

Former presidents George W. Bush—the son of former president (and vice president) George H. W. Bush—and Bill Clinton have been chosen by current president Barack Obama to head up fundraising efforts to help relieve the sufferings of Haitians caused by the January 12, 2010 earthquake in Haiti.

The White House hopes that this teaming-up of the two former presidents will be as effective as was Bill Clinton’s teaming-up with former president George H. W. Bush (George W.’s father) in raising funds for the relief of the Indonesians who were devastated by the tsunami, which occurred there on December 26, 2004.

I lived in Arkansas from 1988-2005, and I am all too aware of what actually went on there during the 1980’s and 1990’s: political corruption, cocaine trafficking, and murder.

If you think that I’m just another one of those conspiracy cranks, then I suggest that you re-read the paragraph above. I lived in Arkansas *for seventeen years*.

If you doubt what I am about to tell you, I would suggest that you read the definitive book on this subject: *The Boys on the Tracks*, by Mara Leveritt; a highly respected investigative journalist who has

been with the [Arkansas](#) for many years. Another excellent book on this subject is: [\*The Secret Life of Bill Clinton\*](#), by [Andrew Evans-Pritchard](#), who actually devotes an entire chapter of his book to the murder of Jerry Parks, once the head of Bill Clinton's security in Little Rock, which I will relate to you now.

To give you just one simple example of my personal experiences in Arkansas during this time, I was home on the evening of September 26, 1993 watching the [KATV](#) (Little Rock Channel 7, 10 o'clock) News, and the lead story that night was that someone had, that evening, been murdered in a drive-by shooting on Highway 10 in west Little Rock. Having lived, by this time, in Little Rock for five years, I was quite well aware of the fact that drive-by shootings occurred rather frequently. Someone actually shot-up *my* house (on 16<sup>th</sup> Street) one night—barely missing my (now ex) wife.

The thought that immediately popped into my head— upon hearing that someone had been murdered in a drive-by shooting on Highway 10 in west Little Rock—was: “No one *ever* gets shot in a drive-by shooting on Highway 10 in west Little Rock, because that’s the wealthy side of town. A drive-by shooting on Wright Avenue or on 17<sup>th</sup> Street can (and did) occur at any time, but out on Highway 10, in west Little Rock? *No way*. This was no drive-by shooting: *this was a hit*.”

Well, I didn’t know Jerry Parks—the man who was murdered that night—but it turns out that a man I had recently met (in church, a year or so earlier)—and who, since that time, has become my best friend—knew him very well: they once worked together, as police officers, in Arkansas. As my friend puts it to me, in what, I suppose, is police lingo: “He [Jerry Parks] was ventilated” out on Highway 10 that night.

Parks, now a *former* police officer, had been working as Bill Clinton’s head of security in Little Rock and had decided to quit working for Clinton, choosing instead to go into the private security business, and he was beginning to *write down* all he knew about Bill Clinton. As Evans-Pritchard points out in his book, when Parks heard the news of White House counsel Vince Foster’s death, he said: “[I’m a dead man](#).”

[Vince Foster](#) (January 15, 1945 - July 20, 1993) was a Deputy White House Counsel during the first term of President Bill Clinton and had been a member of the (prestigious) [Rose Law Firm](#), in Little Rock—along with (now Secretary of State) [Hillary Clinton](#) and [Webster Hubbell](#) (former associate attorney general in the Clinton Justice Department). Foster’s death was shrouded in mystery—a supposed [suicide](#), which was surrounded by [odd, non-suicide-like evidence and circumstances](#).

I remember when, shortly after Foster’s death, the national news media was all over this story; informing us that the FBI would soon be

investigating Foster's files at the Rose Law Firm. At the time I was working for a local printing paper distributor in Little Rock, and one of the customers I delivered copy paper to (on a regular basis) was Rose Law Firm (I would always deliver a pallet of copy paper (i.e., forty cartons) to the firm about once a week or so).

I made a delivery to Rose Law Firm during this time and I was not surprised to discover boxes with Vince Foster's name on them (stacked) in the back stairwell, which was the stairwell I used in order to deliver copy paper down to their (basement) copier room. What *did* surprise me, however, was that there was a brand new paper shredder, which I had never seen before, in the first office, which I had to go through in order to get to the copier room, and I saw two people *very busily* shredding lots and lots of documents.

I met a couple of FBI agents there—in that same stairwell—about a week later.

I'd like to explain, now, the corruption, cocaine, and murder connection which exists between (then vice president) George H. W. Bush and (then governor) Bill Clinton, which began shortly before I arrived in Arkansas in 1988.

From the time that I first arrived in Arkansas the information I was gathering from the [local newspaper](#) made it apparent to me that, throughout the early-to-mid 1980's, a man named Barry Seal had been running a weapons/cocaine smuggling operation out of a small, rural airport in western Arkansas, which was located near the town of [Mena, Arkansas](#). Seal—a government informant—would fly weapons from the U. S. (i.e., Mena, [Arkansas](#)) down to [Nicaragua](#), in order to supply the (anti-communist) [Contra](#) rebels there who were, at the time, fighting against the (communist) [Sandinistas](#); Seal would then fly on to [Colombia](#) in order to pick up a load of cocaine for his return flight back to the U. S.

The CIA was involved in using Seal to run weapons to the Contras and cocaine back to the U. S. and, in time, they set Seal up to be discovered—as a [DEA](#) informant—by [Pablo Escobar](#) and his men. On February 19, 1986 Barry Seal was gunned down in Baton Rouge, Louisiana—by Escobar's men—and the CIA took over his weapons/cocaine running operation.

As PBS [Frontline](#) explains it:

"The Washington Times [ran] a story which details DEA informant Barry Seal's successful infiltration into the Medellin cartel's operations in Panama. The story was leaked by Oliver North show the Nicaraguan Sandanistas' involvement in the drug trade. Ten days later, Carlos Lehder, Pablo Escobar, Jorge Ochoa and Jose Gonzalo Rodri-

guez Gacha are indicted by a Miami federal grand jury based on evidence obtained by Seal. In February 1986, Seal is assassinated in Baton Rouge by gunmen hired by the cartel" (see [timeline](#), under the heading of: "1984 The Drug War and the Cold War Collide" on the PBS [Frontline](#) "Thirty Years of America's Drug War: A Chronology" [timeline](#)).

As the headline of this article states, George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton were involved in corruption, cocaine, and murder because they [directly facilitated](#) the CIA's Mena, Arkansas weapons/cocaine smuggling operation. This truth about Bush and Clinton—along with additional information implicating (many) other guilty persons as well—is *precisely* what Arkansas Times investigative reporter [Mara Leveritt exposes](#) in her book: *The Boys on the Tracks*. As you can well imagine, the reason for why George H. W. Bush—former [director](#) of the CIA—and Bill Clinton—former [governor](#) of Arkansas—are such good buddies is that Bush needed both the cooperation and the cover that Clinton could provide for the CIA's weapons/cocaine operation, which was run out of Arkansas during the 1980's.

This truth—as well as the fact that [crack cocaine](#) was introduced [by the CIA](#) into Los Angeles, during this same period of time—has since come out in numerous [sources](#) and also ties-in to what later became known as the [Iran](#) (i.e., the sale of weapons by the U. S. government [under Regan](#)) to Iran in order to secure the release of U. S. hostages then being held by Iran; the proceeds of this weapons sale were then funneled, illegally, to the Contras—Regan's anti-communist [Freedom Fighters](#) in Nicaragua).

As Mara Leveritt (in her book) points out, the citizens of Mena, Arkansas, during the time period when this gun/drug running operation was being carried out, grew suspicious of the unusual amount of activity at the small, regional Mena airport; suspicions they brought to the attention of local and, eventually, federal authorities. In Arkansas, there are two Federal Court Districts: the Western and Eastern Districts, and Mena, Arkansas lies in the Western District. The U. S. Attorney for the Western District, at the time, whose responsibility it became to investigate the suspicious airport activity was one Asa Hutchinson. Hutchinson opened—and quickly closed—the case; told, apparently, (by higher-ups) that the suspicious airport activities were “off-limits”.

As Leveritt explains it:

“But some strange things happened in Hutchinson's district while he was federal prosecutor . . . Specifically, a man identified by federal agents as "a documented, major narcotics trafficker" was using facili-

ties at an airport in Hutchinson's district for "storage, maintenance, and modification" of his drug-running aircraft, throughout most of Hutchinson's tenure. The man was Adler Berriman "Barry" Seal. For the last four years of his life---and throughout Hutchinson's term as U.S. attorney---his base of operations was Mena, Arkansas. In 1982, the year that Hutchinson took office as U.S. attorney and Seal moved to Mena, federal officials were already aware that he controlled 'an international smuggling organization' that was 'extremely well organized and extensive.' Agents for the DEA, FBI, U.S. Customs, and IRS were watching him. They brought Hutchinson evidence that Seal was 'involved in narcotics trafficking and the laundering of funds derived from such trafficking' (*The Blacklisted Journalist Column Seventy, April 2002*).

In 2001, then president George W. Bush—the son of former president George H. W. Bush—appointed Asa Hutchinson to head the [Drug Enforcement Agency](#) (DEA) and, after September 11, 2001, Bush “tapped Hutchinson to lead the [Border and Transportation Security Directorate](#), the largest division of the [Department of Homeland Security](#) (DHS) with more than 110,000 employees. Hutchinson was confirmed by [unanimous consent](#) by the U.S. Senate on January 23, 2003” (Wikipedia [entry](#) for [Asa Hutchinson](#)).

All of this is VERY shady, is it not? The Wikipedia [entry](#) for Asa Hutchinson even goes so far as to tell us that: “During his tenure as U.S. Attorney for the Western District, Hutchinson was described as aggressive in his efforts to prosecute criminals. However, there are continuing suspicions regarding his actions surrounding the investigation of infamous pilot and drug smuggler [Barry Seal](#), a key operator in the Iran-Contra scandal.<sup>11</sup> Hutchinson opened the investigation into Seal but did not see the case through to completion when he resigned to run for the Senate” (see [entry](#)).

I've never met Asa Hutchinson, but I have met his brother [Tim Hutchinson](#) who, at the time, was a (Republican) U. S. senator, representing the state of Arkansas in Washington, D. C.

I met Tim Hutchinson at the anti-abortion [March for Life](#) in Little Rock, which is held every January 22—the anniversary of the infamous Roe v. Wade U. S. Supreme Court decision that mandated access to abortion on demand throughout all fifty states, regardless of state laws (abortion is still illegal according to Arkansas state law).

By this time (2002) I had decided to get into politics and run for U. S. representative (Arkansas' Second Congressional District, which is the greater Little Rock area) and I had gone to the March for Life with the intention of doing a little campaigning and hoping, possibly, to speak at the rally, which followed the march. I hadn't yet filed to run for office and my campaign was still unofficial at this point, but I was

doing my best to get word of my campaign out to the people. When I was up on the podium, on the steps of the state capitol, I was speaking with [Mike Huckabee](#) and his wife [Janet](#)—then Governor and First Lady of the State of Arkansas—and Janet had taken quite an interest in me and in my campaign brochure.

Tim Hutchinson was off to one side of me and, although he didn't approach me at that time, his secret service bodyguard did; asking me if he could have one of my campaign brochures. At the time, I thought nothing of it; but later on I realized that this was probably the cause behind what was to occur shortly thereafter.

About a week after the March for Life, I noticed that my land-line phone was making a brief, odd clicking sound, and all of my friends (who were calling me) began mentioning the fact that my phone was making a strange, brief, clicking sound. I suspected, as did my friends, that my phone had been tapped—illegally, since I was doing nothing wrong.

One day, not long afterward, I arrived home to find that I had a message on my answering machine, which was no surprise and, when I played the message, I heard a man's voice—scrambled, by an electronic voice scrambling device—threatening to kill me, which *did* surprise me. Not that the death threat in itself surprised me, because it didn't, I was surprised by the fact that the voice I heard was being *scrambled* by an electronic voice scrambler. I was impressed, but I certainly wasn't afraid.

Paranoid? Yes. Afraid? No.

I never could raise enough money for the filing fee (\$5,000), because I was virtually broke—as were many of my friends and supporters—so my first attempt at a making a bid for federal office was still-born. There's much more to this aspect of my personal story, but there's really not much else that I can tell you that is relevant to purpose of this article which, by this point, has gone on quite long enough already. I lived in Arkansas for only a few more years after these events had occurred.

If you've read this far, I hope the next time you see George W. Bush and Bill Clinton—out-and-about on their Haiti relief tour—you will remember the peoples and events that I've related to you in this article.

This story of corruption, cocaine, and murder has been told many, many times, although—even to this day—it is usually relegated to the realm of unproven and unprovable conspiracy theories. Unfortunately, the story is true; and many of its all-to-real characters—like [Jerry Parks](#)—have ended up dead—murdered.

So please think about [them](#) the next time you see [these two criminal](#) out-and-about on the good old Haiti relief tour, okay?

# Our Politicians in Washington Are Leading Us to (Literal) Destruction

*“Or what king, going to encounter another king in war, will not sit down first and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him who comes against him with twenty thousand? And if not, while the other is yet a great way off, he sends an embassy and asks terms of peace.”* (Jesus Christ, in Luke 14:31-32)

I am not exaggerating when I say that our political “leaders” in Washington are leading us to destruction, and I mean this quite literally.

Our support of Israel and our enmity against Iran, which is Israel’s enemy and, therefore, our enemy as well, will, ultimately, lead to the virtual destruction of our nation by Israel’s (and our) most powerful enemies: China, Russia, and Iran (in case you doubt Russia’s friendship with China, I suggest that you do your homework; starting [here](#)).

And if you think that I’m exaggerating, I’m not. I only wish that I were.

It doesn’t take an Einstein to figure this one out either; to anyone who is truly aware of the dire situation in which we currently find ourselves it’s simply a matter of awareness and common sense (both of which our politicians in Washington lack).

China is Iran’s [ally](#); and has been for many, many years. China currently has [thousands](#) of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM’s), which are quite capable of reaching *all regions* of the continental United States, and each of these ICBM’s has *multiple* nuclear warheads.

Our political “leaders” in Washington continue to lead our nation down the wrong path in the Middle East. We have invaded Iraq and Afghanistan and we have built [permanent military](#) throughout the Middle East, many of which now [surround](#) China’s ally: Iran. And our

politicians continue to treat Iran belligerently, because Iran is a threat—*the enemy*—of Israel; as are all of the other Muslim nations throughout the Middle East.

This present course of action, by Washington, which is simply the continuation of long-standing U. S. (and British) foreign policy regarding the Middle East, is *wrong-headed* (in the worst way) and needs—*desperately*—to be corrected—soon, *before it's too late*.

Does anyone in America honestly believe that China, Iran, Russia, North Korea, and all of the Middle Eastern Muslim nations are *afraid* of the U. S. and Great Britain? I can assure you, *they are not afraid of us*. Why should they be afraid of [empires that are collapsing](#) before their very eyes? These nations are more confident than ever that *they will be the victors* in any military conflict that will arise between them and us.

In short, an accurate scenario of World War III would envision the allied powers of the U. S., Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand versus the axis powers of China, Russia, Iran, North Korea, and pretty much *every other nation on earth*. If you think, for a moment, that Europe—especially Germany and France—will support us, *you can forget it*. For one thing, Germany has been [friends](#) with Iran for years now, and so has [France](#); and, for another thing, these nations are *on the same continent* as Russia and China (I.e., [Eurasia](#)).

China is *not concerned in the least* with the (literal) fallout that would result from a nuclear confrontation with the U. S., because, in the first place, they will simply crash our defense computer systems (leaving us defenseless) and then they will annihilate us; in the second place, there is nothing but ocean between us and them; and that's where the nuclear fallout will end up: in the Atlantic, far from Chinese shores (the prevailing winds in North America blow from west to east, in case you are unaware of this meteorological [fact](#)).

This scenario is very unlike the cold war, when the U. S. and the Soviet Union had, what was then referred to as Mutually Assured Destruction (or, [MAD](#)), because China, unlike the old Soviet Union, is *well able to defeat* our defense computers (upon which we have become far too dependent) by way of [cyber attacks](#).

Suffice it to say that I am not crying wolf here; far from it: *our politicians are leading America to imminent destruction at the hands of our enemies*.

Arrogance, pride, and hubris always come before destruction, *and our politicians in Washington are full of it*.

This image, of America as *arrogant*, is the image people overseas (especially in the Middle East) have of the U. S.; and this is *not* the fault of the American *people*—on the contrary, virtually *everyone* I ever talk to says that we simply need to *butt-out* of everyone's busi-

ness—this is the fault of *our political leadership* and their dismal foreign policy failures.

What is really distressing to me, personally, is that *the solution* to this impending crisis (i.e., the obliteration of America, as we know it, in a nuclear conflagration) *is so simple*, and yet our politicians in Washington, on their own, will *never* do what needs to be done: *tell the world that we have stopped supporting Israel and that we are bringing our troops home from the Middle East—for good—now.*

This would *immediately* solve the present crisis and it would also (immediately) put us *in good stead* with our (and Israel's) enemies. And, more importantly, *the U. S. would be doing the right thing*. What the Muslim nations of the Middle East hate most about the U. S. is *our hypocrisy*: we *say* that we are *for* human rights and freedoms, and *yet we support Israel's shameful—sinful—murderous oppression of the Palestinian peoples*, especially the murdering of innocent in Gaza.

If I had kids, I would be very afraid for their safety and their security here in the U. S., because, while our politicians are bickering over bullshit issues in Washington, they have succeeded in turning virtually *the entire world* against us. They will never stop backing Israel any more than they will ever end farm subsidies or Social Security, because they could never be elected (or reelected) if they did; and THAT is their only, real concern: *personal, political power*. They don't care about you, me, or your children any more than they care about those poor little children that the Israelis blow to pieces (with U. S.-made weapons and U. S. funding) in their “safety” of their own homes in (concentration camp-like) Gaza.

There one—and only one—viable solution to this crisis, which is the direct result of the leadership failure (of BOTH political parties) in Washington: the American people must descend—en masse—upon Washington to protest for change (*real change*); now. And I'm not talking about a small, insignificant protest by jobless activists either; I'm talking about average, working people who are willing to not go to work, because they are in Washington D. C. *demanding* change, until they (we) get the change we so desperately need.

*This is what people do (and have done) in other nations when they know that their governments are broken and that they need *real* change, and it's time that we do the same.*

*This is the ONLY solution to our current crisis* (I can assure you that another election will solve *nothing*).

I realize that people have bills to pay and children to feed, but if we don't get the change we need in Washington—soon—it will be too late; there will be no more bills to pay and there will be no more children to feed, *because most of us, as well as most of our friends and our families, will be dead*. The result of a nuclear conflagration—the likes of

which the world has never seen—thanks to our “leaders” in Washington.

## Washington Politicians: A Brood of Vipers

*[A]ccording to Thomas [Aquinas], he [the ruler] may not take private property beyond what public need requires, though strictly speaking property is an institution of Human rather than Natural law. Above all, the rulership of one man over another must not take away the free moral agency of the subject. No man is bound to obedience in all respects and even the soul of the slave is free (a doctrine Aristotle would hardly have understood). It is for this reason that the resistance of tyranny is not only a right but a duty.”*

George H. Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, Third Edition (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1937; 1965) pp. 255-256

(Human law, which is guided by and based upon Natural law, is the *philosophical anchor* of American political theory, and it is enshrined in [The Declaration of Independence](#).)

“. . . [T]he resistance of tyranny is not only a right but a duty.” I like that. The Founders of the United States of America were resisters of tyranny. They were also elitists and aristocrats, but they were *true* aristocrats: they were good and honorable men. Not so with our leaders in Washington today. It’s no surprise that elitists and aristocrats would rule over us today, just as they always have, but the pseudo-aristocratic, politicians/criminals we have in Washington today are a much different breed of men: they’re not a breed, actually, they’re more like a brood; *a brood of vipers*.

From their hallowed, marble (taxpayer-funded) snake-hole sanctuaries in Washington, D. C. they continue to fleece the flock that they are supposed to care for and, with the help of both the media and

their corporate special interests, they are pulling the wool over the eyes of the American people.

They are *not* ruling us well, and the current situation needs to be remedied.

For one thing, there needs to be term limits imposed upon ALL elected officials, especially those in Washington; and especially upon those elected to the U. S. Senate. Just listen to this ridiculous [tripe](#) from Senator Chris Dodd (D-CT) who, after thirty years, finally decided NOT to run for reelection:

“I have been a Connecticut Senator for 30 years. I'm proud of the job I've done and the results delivered. But none of us are irreplaceable. None of us are indispensable. Those who think otherwise are dangerous . . . And that is how I came to the conclusion that, in the long sweep of American history, there are moments for each elected public servant to step aside and let someone else step up. This is my moment to step aside.”

“Hey Chris Dodd: If you REALLY believe that, then why didn't you “step aside” TWENTY YEARS AGO?!”

What a load of crap. And Dodd's not the only one; [not by a long shot](#). Just look at the late Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA), who was in the U. S. Senate FOR FORTY-SIX YEARS! Is it any wonder that fiction writer Vince Flynn created a character (for his first novel) that was a thinly veiled depiction of the long-serving Senator Kennedy? What shocks me most is that Flynn actually uses Kennedy as *the model Senator*; that is, as *the model of the type of senator who should be targeted for assassination*.

The title of Flynn's (first) novel? [Term Limits](#).

Has it come to this? Are American readers being entertained by the notion that the only way to remove these corrupt senators from power is to assassinate them?

Apparently so. Sadly, limiting these the terms of Washington politicians is not up to *the people*, it's up to . . . you guessed it: the Washington politicians themselves, which is why they *don't* have term limits. Like voting themselves pay raises, which they also do, these elected officials are the *only* people who have the power to impose any limitations upon their own terms of office.

So what are these pseudo-aristocratic, political/criminal elitists in Washington up to these days? The same old shit; they're busy [obstructing important legislation](#) in order to further and protect their

own, personal pork-barrel projects (at our expense, of course) and to fatten their own wallets and purses.

But is *this* what our best and brightest citizens are supposed to be doing? No, it's not. Do you honestly believe they can truly relate to their fellow citizens who are struggling, financially, and unable to find work? I seriously doubt it, because most of them are quite wealthy. Many of them, especially the ones you always see on the news, are millionaires many times over. How can these people possibly relate to those whom they refer to as: *the working poor*?

They can't; they don't; and they never will.

Do you think, for a moment, that they really *care* about the plight of the working poor, as they call us? The term *working poor* is, in itself, a demeaning and condescending term. The Democrats conjured up this term simply for political/rhetorical purposes, to make themselves *appear* more compassionate than those *mean spirited* Republicans. What bullshit. ("Hey all you filthy-ass federal Democrat AND Republican criminals/politicians up there in Washington . . . you like rhetoric? I'll give you rhetoric: 'Why don't all you slimy-ass snakes just slink back down into your holes, because we're coming for you!?'")

Even now, in the depths of the worst economic depression since the 1930's, our politicians in Washington are wining and dining at the most expensive restaurants; being driven around town in their big limousines; and living the high-life in their big homes in fancy, upscale neighborhoods.

Guess what: *They don't care about us; they never have and they never will.*

They tell us unemployment is "hovering around ten percent", but are *they* looking for work? Like you and I have to? Of course they aren't. When was the last time *any of these people* had to look for a job? Do you think they care that the working poor, as they like to (patronizingly) refer to us, have a *real* unemployment rate much closer to twenty-to-thirty percent and that we are angry and getting even angrier because of it? That we are angry because of them and because of what they have done to our nation's manufacturing base and to our national economy?

I don't think they have a clue. They're sitting up there, in Washington, inside their inside-the-beltway ivory towers, laughing at us; because, to them, we're simply poor, powerless fools.

I mean, what do they really have to be afraid of? What can anyone ever do to get rid of them, to really change the corrupt way in which these corrupt Washington politicians do their crooked political/business dealings? What are *we* supposed to do? Threaten their lives or shoot them in the heads like the characters in Vince Flynn's novel do? Is *that* what it will actually take?

What we need are for some *true* aristocrats—those who are good, just, intelligent, powerful, ambitious, and wealthy—to have the *courage* to throw those bastards out; *by force if necessary*. Just like Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, Jay, and all of those guys did . . . to King George III and his crooked Englishman cronies.

If these true aristocrats, whoever they may be, will lead the way, I, for one, will be one of the first to follow them.

To guide us, we have the greatest political/philosophical document in American history; the greatest political/philosophical document that's ever been written: [The Declaration of Independence](#).

I suggest that you [read it](#); carefully.

I would suggest that all of those rich fat-cat crooked politicians in Washington read it too, but what good would *that* do? Fuck them. They're nothing but a brood of vipers. And they should be treated as such.

*“Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree bad, and its fruit bad; for the tree is known by its fruit. You brood of vipers! how can you speak good, when you are evil?” (Matthew 12:33-34)*

*“And behold, you have risen in your fathers’ stead, a brood of sinful men, to increase still more the fierce anger of the Lord . . . For if you turn away from following him, he will again abandon them in the wilderness; and you will destroy all this people.” (Numbers 32:14-15)*

*“When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.*

*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and*

*to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness . . .” (The Declaration of Independence).*



## Political Musings

Have things gotten so bad in the U. S. that our collective political frustrations could actually lead some people to commit acts of political violence? Could some people's *words* actually incite some people to commit *acts* of political violence? These are questions many Americans seem to be asking themselves these days.

The U.S. has a very long [history](#) of civil unrest and political violence, so it should come as no surprise to us, especially during politically frustrating times, that politically violent acts (of various types) will likely be committed by some people. Well chosen words can incite powerful emotions, and well chosen words concerning genuine political issues and the frustrations which accompany them, can certainly incite some people to act violently. To think that words can have no effect upon people whatsoever—either toward their pursuing good actions or for ill—is simply ridiculous. Words are very powerful; "more powerful", it is said, "than the sword".

We live in a violent world. And when it comes to political violence, *terrorism* is the latest threat to the established (government) order(s). Terrorism is really not a major concern here in the U. S., although the established governmental order would like for us to believe that it is, but it is a major concern in many other countries (e.g., Israel, Columbia, India). The U. S. Government acts as if terrorism was a very real threat here, especially after 9/11, but it doesn't believe that terrorism is a threat to the established government order itself.

The party members of all well established political/governmental orders, such as the U. S., Russia, and China, don't fear their subjects rising up against them and demanding real political/governmental change, but they do fear the destabilization and disorder which can be caused by acts of political violence and terrorism. What the ruling party members of the well established orders fear most is a successful political takeover of the government (*a coup d'état*), which is orchestrated by their political rivals and removes them from power.

Here in the U. S., we are witnesses to a lot of political wrangling but we never see any real change in the way the federal government operates: it continues on, unimpeded, growing ever larger and ever

more powerful. It doesn't seem to matter which political party happens to be in power, whether conservative or liberal, because the established federal governmental order continues to raises taxes, continues to spend those tax revenues exorbitantly, and continues to pass more and more laws and regulations that further infringe upon the personal properties, liberties, and freedoms of the ordinary U. S. citizen who is (supposedly) protected from these sorts of federal government intrusions by the first Ten Amendments, the [Bill of Rights](#), to the [U. S. Constitution](#).

We've [seen](#) what these well established political/governmental orders will do to their enemies. We know that people who are accused of committing or of planning to commit acts of political violence in these nations will face imprisonment and torture. If convicted of committing or of planning to commit acts of political violence, they will also face the possibility or *probability* of execution.

There will never be any change in the way in which these well established political/government orders ultimately maintain control over their subjects: the threat of violence and the use of violence.

Governments want a monopoly on violence. And it's unlikely that the ruling regimes of the U. S., Russia, and China, all of which were founded upon revolutions, will ever be overthrown by an armed revolutionary/political movement. These nations have become so powerful militarily and so efficient at controlling their populations that their overthrow would be impossible.

The majority of those who desire to see major political change are not in positions of political power within the ruling regime (upper party members) and they do not benefit from being part of the political/governmental regime (i.e., as government employees/lower party members) and, in order to effect political changes, there's really very little they can do besides vote. I think this is what's giving rise to the recent concern about the possibility of political violence occurring in the U. S.: many citizens feel they are being oppressed by government over-taxation and infringements upon their personal liberties but they are powerless to change things. Political powerlessness leads to political frustration, and political frustration leads to political violence.

In our modern world, this political frustration reaches its logical conclusion in acts of political violence; especially suicide bombings. The modern (or postmodern) tactic of suicide bombings sprung from the fertile soil of the Israeli oppression of the Palestinian people. Virtually powerless against the nation of Israel, the Palestinian people, out of political desperation, sought to inflict casualties upon the people of Israel by any means necessary, which included a willingness to sacrifice its own people.

A seventeen year old young women doesn't strap a bomb to herself—with the express intention of killing herself and as many Israelis

as she possibly can—without feeling political desperation in the extreme. There is no other explanation. And all the suicide bombings that have occurred in the nation of Israel have originated from Israel's tyrannical oppression of the Palestinian people.

The Palestinians know they can't defeat Israel in a conventional war, but they believe they can cause Israel enough trouble to make it not worth their while to continue their occupation of Palestine. Like the Zionist terrorists who made life so miserable for the British that they eventually abandoned their occupation of Palestine (leaving it to the Zionists, to whom it later became the modern nation of Israel).

In dealing with modern, powerful, and well established political and governmental orders/regimes, political dissenters resort to political violence because—knowing that the established order cannot be overthrown by a revolutionary military force—they want to cause the established order as much trouble as they can. And because it allows the dissidents to present their grievances to the established order in a form that is both powerful and symbolic.

Well established orders understand power, as well as the power of symbolism; their own political/governmental power having been established long ago and enshrined in enduring symbolic forms (e.g., flags, seals, monuments, songs, myths). And these orders will cover their own acts of political violence with a cloak of political symbolism.

A revolutionary movement within a well established order should be built upon the established order's own political power and political symbolism whenever possible. If, for example, the established order has overstepped its bounds of authority and become corrupt but has a long history and a solid philosophical/political basis, what is needed is a revolution that can restore the order to its former historical and philosophical principles.

Here in the U. S., any revolutionary movement that hopes for success would be wise to cloak both their speech and their actions with the political symbolism which represents that which grounds the established order both historically and philosophically because it is the established order's traditional and historical political philosophy which the revolutionary movement desires to see restored.

The Left has never had success with its revolutionary political speech and acts here in the U. S. because its political philosophy has no ties to traditional, historical U. S. political philosophy. The right to private property, for example, is enshrined in the Declaration of Independence; but revolutionary Leftists believe the notion of private property should be abolished; a belief which is, in fact, central to the Left's communist/socialist political philosophy.

Any successful restorative revolution or reformation of American government must be based upon a return to America's politically violent beginnings, its early political symbolism, and the political philos-

ophy upon which it was based. Many Americans are politically frustrated today because they are fed up with the modern incarnation of the U. S. federal government, which grows ever larger by feeding upon it ever increasing tax revenues. What these Americans desire is to see their federal government restored by having its reach restricted by returning it, at least to some degree, to the limits that were imposed upon it by the [Tenth Amendment](#) to the [U. S. Constitution](#).

The real question is: How likely is it that any revolutionary/reformist movement, which chooses to set itself over against the powerful and well established political/governmental order to which the citizens involved in these movements are subject, could have even the slightest chance of success?

With the efficiency of today's science and technology, along with the motivating drive for greater efficiency that resides within any large centralized government, any politically dissident movement will certainly be infiltrated, monitored, and controlled. The established orders fear the disorder and chaos caused by political violence, anarchy, and terrorism aroused by anti-establishment/anti-government rhetoric.

I doubt that any politically violent act or series of acts could ever have much of an effect upon the currently established political/governmental order here in the U. S. Such acts would only strengthen, not diminish, the government's hold upon its citizens.

That having been said, factionalism is certainly becoming more evident in the U. S. As I mentioned above, the real fear established orders have come not from the order's citizens but from factions within the established orders themselves. A political philosophy which rivals the reigning political philosophy of the established order and which also has many politically powerful adherents is a very real threat to the established order. And in the U. S., which, traditionally, is a very conservative nation, and I think the rival political philosophy the established order is most afraid of, now, is called: [libertarianism](#).

Only one of the two political parties, the Republicans, could be considered receptive to the libertarian political philosophy. For example, Republicans say they are for reducing the size of the federal government whereas the Democrats believe that a further expansion of federal government power and control is the only possible solution to all of our socioeconomic problems. But neither party really represents anything except the *status quo*; each party representing only a particular faction that exists within the one established political/governmental order which, over time, has truly become a leviathan; in [Hobbes](#) sense of the term, meaning: it's become the kind of all-powerful state Hobbes thought necessary to solve the problem of social order.

Any reformation coming from within the established political/governmental order will likely be from right, rather than from the left. And any politically violent agitations from either the left or the right wings of these political factions will only increase the right's hold. Leftist anarchy will breed increasingly totalitarian tactics of surveillance and control, and there's enough of that already. The crack-down on individual liberties that took place after 9/11 and the ongoing militarization of police powers are already out of hand and any future political violence will only worsen the current situation, which is already quite bleak.

The liberties and freedoms we enjoy here in the U. S. are being infringed upon, but at least we had the liberties and freedoms to be infringed upon to begin with. All citizens who are controlled by large and powerful centralized governments will find their liberties and freedoms increasingly infringed upon by their governments in the name of security. And as bad as things may be getting here in the U. S., imagine how much worse things could be. For example, the governments of China, Iran, and North Korea are today—right now—engaged in the most brutal and totalitarian forms of repression, which is a most egregious infringement of the rights, liberties, and freedoms of the citizens of these nations.



## Outlines of Revolution: America

This is a very simple outline of revolution. America, as a nation, is in trouble; and, as American citizens, it is our responsibility—our duty—to serve our country in whatever ways that we can in its time of need. The question now is: “Has the political situation in America actually gotten so bad—so desperate—that it can only be remedied by revolutionary action?”

I’ve already expressed, in detail, [elsewhere](#), the answer to this question: “Yes, *our government is broken*; and *all normal means of repairing it are broken* as well.”

This, to me—as well as to many, many Americans—is the sad, but sobering, truth about our country.

This is not something that I enjoy having to talk about, but I’m not going to close my eyes to this truth; nor will I simply sit back and do nothing while the nation I love becomes—for all practical purposes—a [haunt of jackals](#).

I’ve known, for many, many years now, that our nation was in serious trouble; but, until now, there has never been cause to call for revolution. For those of us today who have eyes to see and ears to hear: Now is the time—today is the day—for revolution in America.

There are, of course, [many serious political](#) which must be [addressed](#), but there are only two, top priority issues that demand our most urgent and immediate attention: 1) the on-going war in Iraq and Afghanistan and 2) U. S. support of Israel.

Everything else is secondary to these issues. The U. S. oppression and killing of [innocent](#) and [Afghanistan](#) and the [U. S.-backed](#) oppression and killing of [innocent Palestinian](#) by Israel are unjust [crimes](#), which must be stopped; immediately.

Although I want Americans to do the right thing—end the war and end U. S. support of Israel—because this is the right thing to do, I also appeal to their sense of survival: the War on Terror is *not* keeping Americans safe, on the contrary, the War on Terror is leading us into a [World War III](#), scenario, which [we will not—and cannot—win](#).

If Americans don't want to do the right thing, then perhaps they'll do what needs to be done *simply in order to save their own skins?*

And, as difficult as this for many of my fellow Christians to understand, they must understand the *biblical* truth: [Israel](#); thus the modern nation of Israel is *not* the nation of God's chosen people; it is a [murderous](#), [oppressive](#) and [secular Zionist](#) that Christians [cannot support](#).

I am, have been, and will continue to call upon all willing and able American citizens to do whatever is necessary in order to bring about the [revolutionary](#) that America so desperately needs. And what we need is for all willing and able Americans to be involved in massive, non-violent, work-stopping demonstrations against the current political regime in Washington—*until we get the real change that we demand*; just as the People of other nations have done in [Czechoslovakia](#), [Ukraine](#), and—most recently—in [Iran](#),

*There is no other solution.* If there were, then I would state the case for it here, and I would support it; but there isn't. I wish that there were. I wish there were a real possibility that the next election could bring about the real change that we need; but it won't. And this is why revolution is our only option.

Bill Quigley, in his article: “[Time for a U. S.](#)” (on [Common-Dreams.org](#)), explains:

“It is time for a revolution. Government does not work for regular people. It appears to work quite well for big corporations, banks, insurance companies, military contractors, lobbyists, and for the rich and powerful. But it does not work for [regular] people. The 1776 Declaration of Independence states that when a long train of abuses by those in power evidence a design to reduce the rights of the people to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, it is the people's right, in fact their duty, to engage in a revolution.”

I couldn't agree more Bill; and I, myself, have been [saying](#) exactly this lately. In fact, I've gone to great lengths to detail some of the most important aspects of this “long train of abuses”, especially those abuses that have *taken away the rights to which we are entitled* by the [first ten amendments](#) to the [U. S.](#), better known as: [The Bill of Rights](#).

Here's just a *partial* list of these abuses:

Our *First Amendment* rights: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting [the free exercise thereof](#); or abridging the [freedom of speech](#), or of the press; or the right of the people [peaceably to assemble](#), and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

Our *Fourth Amendment* rights: “The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against [unreasonable searches](#) and seizures, shall not be violated, and [no warrants shall](#)

[issue, but upon probable cause](#), supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized”.

Our *Fifth Amendment* rights: “No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, [unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury](#), except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject [for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy](#) of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, [without due process of law](#); nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation”.

Our *Tenth Amendment* rights: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are [reserved to the States](#) respectively, or to the people”.

Our *Fourteenth Amendment* rights: “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce [any law](#); nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, [or property](#); nor to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws”.

As I said, this is just a *partial* list.

I can imagine the Founding Fathers of this great nation, were they able to travel through time into the present, scolding us and saying: “Why have you not risen up and cast off the chains of this tyranny?”

Why indeed?

As I’ve also said, the revolution we are calling for is a non-violent—people power—revolution. One in which the People stop working, rise up, descend *en masse* upon Washington in order to demand the real, political change we need—NOW—and not leave Washington until we get it.

At the present time, this is the only solution we have. And I realize the many, many difficulties that are involved in organizing such a massive revolutionary movement. It will be hard to impress upon the People the urgency of the matter at hand, especially the importance of protesting over working, in order to get the real change we so desperately need, and the heavy-handed police-state tactics that the government will use to retain its hold on power and to shut us down.

I can only say, “Let’s hope that we can do this, non-violently; because, if our government does something stupid, like killing innocent, non-violent protesters—as the governments of China and, most recently, Iran have done—all bets will be off, and the way of non-violence will yield to the way of violence.”

Remember, I am calling for a *non-violent* revolution. Violence, especially the use of deadly force is something to be avoided *at all costs*.

I detest the taking of human life; especially innocent lives. But I am not averse to taking lives in self defense, in the defense of others, or in warfare that is considered just—which is rare and is basically self-defense writ large (i.e., on a *national* scale ).

It is against the law in this nation to engage in speech that calls for—and to engage in activities that intend to cause—the overthrow of the government; and we can be certain that, as things get worse, these laws, especially considering the fact that our nation is currently “at war”, will begin to be enforced more stringently. This, the government hopes, will get rid of the worse agitators and scare off everyone else who desires to see real political change. At the same time, the government will use, as propaganda, these agitators as living examples of why we need more government control, with the express intention of cowering the general population into submission through fear.

The current laws against sedition and treason seem to imply that in order to violate these laws one must advocate for or engage in armed rebellion, which is *not* what I’m calling for. But there is also a sense in which the law, which often uses the term *force*, can be read to mean *force of any kind*; and I’m certainly advocating that the People’s *force*—through massive, work-stopping, non-violent protests—*real political change*, which the current government regime does not want.

(Note: I’m not advocating the overthrow the U. S. Constitution, which I swore to uphold and defend; I’m advocating the overthrow of the currently broken, perverted, and criminal regime in Washington that pretends to be our constitutional government.)

And, as I said, if the government does something stupid, like killing non-violent protesters in order to shut us down, all bets will be off. We will not *start* the violence, but *neither will we shrink from its use*, if necessary; nor will we be intimidated by the government’s use of violence against us. If the corrupt, criminal, established government order wants to fight dirty they will be the ones that will have to *start* it; but, I can assure you, the People will most certainly *finish* it; because the government derives its authority from the consent of the governed (i.e., the People) and the People, who are demanding real change, will get it—one way or another, eventually. You can count on that.

If the People are forced, by the government, to resort to violence—in order to get the real political change that we demand—there are simple, but very effective, means by which the People can eventually defeat the corrupt, entrenched political regime in Washington. Let me now, here, very briefly outline these means for your consideration. (If you’re part of *the problem* in Washington and not part of *the solution*, then I would suggest that you pay very careful attention to what I’m about to say here.)

Fortunately, the government has never succeeded in taking away the American citizenry's Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. Had it ever been successful at this, we would have no hope of ever having a successful revolution here in America if it ever came to violence, which I hope to God that it never does (I've seen many people die a violent death, and I really don't care to see any more). Just knowing the fact that—if the government *does* resort to violence, first—we do have, at our disposal, *the option* of using the force of arms, *if necessary*, is certainly a fact that gives the government pause. It's sort of like the People having a good insurance policy which, although they hope to God they will never have need to use it, they feel better knowing that, should anything bad ever happen, they're at least covered. (Remember: Governments should be afraid of their People; the People should not be afraid of their governments.)

The plan is, very simply, as follows:

Generally speaking, the nation is currently divided, politically, along what can be considered a conservative/rural versus urban/liberal divide (similar to the red state versus blue state division we're perhaps more familiar with). Should it ever come to it, there are about 30million rural, good old boys in America *who are armed* and *who feel the same way that I do* about the government in Washington; and they will gladly fight for their rights and for the rights of their fellow citizens, if need be. Should it ever come to it, there are also about 3.5 million truck drivers out there *who also feel exactly the same way* about Washington and who will be more than happy to stop delivering foodstuffs and other goods to whomsoever the People desire to see starved-out in Washington (i.e., the politicians). In fact, *we can shut down any city in America* in this way—delivering foods-tuffs and other goods to the people *who are with us* and denying them to those *who are against us*.

For example, the one city that I *know* we will blockade, if need be, is Washington; where most of the crooked Washington politicians actually live. And here's what's going to happen, if it comes to it:

I know Washington D. C., because I was born there—I grew up and worked in the area. And I know where the wealthy neighborhoods are and where the poor neighborhoods are. Have you ever heard the old saying, "politics makes strange bedfellows"? Well, here's something you've probably never thought about: Who do you think will be the armed, urban, best buddies of all those armed, rural, good old boys—in Washington and in any other major U. S. city that we wish to shut down? Who, in the cities, is likewise angry with the government, because they know that they are being screwed over by it; who else wants to see real political change in Washington; and who else is armed? That's right, our old friends: the urban ghetto gangsters—who, likewise, have had *all that they can take* of our unjust, oppres-

sive, corrupt, entrenched political regime in Washington. The grocery store shelves will be bare in Northwest Washington, where the elitist politicians live, but the shelves will be well stocked in Southeast Washington and Anacostia, where our poorer brothers and sisters live.

No doubt, if it ever got to this point, the government troops would step in and supply the elitist's grocery stores with food. But do you realize how polarized this nation would have become by the time that it reached such a point? What would the government regime's next plan of action be? Send troops into the countryside and into the ghettos to root out the insurgents? Do they not realize just how easily we could disrupt their supply lines, blend into the civilian population, and cause them trouble *until they finally gave up?* Just like the Iraqi and Afghani insurgents currently do, and just like the Vietnamese insurgents once did.

The corrupt government regime's troops may win every battle but, in the long run, they will, eventually, lose the war.

Have I gotten your attention? Are you seeing my point yet? The People—one way or the other—will get what they demand: a revolution that will lead to a more just society for all Americans.

Whether the government decides that the People will get what they demand *the easy way or the hard way* is yet to be seen; time will tell. It's up to the current regime to decide just how hard they want to play. I hope we can accomplish this non-violently, because war is *a very ugly business*, which *must be avoided* at all costs, which is also why *we never should have sent our troops into Iraq and Afghanistan*—as there was *never a just cause* for us to *wage war* against those nations. But one thing is certain: the time for revolution in America has finally arrived.

## Ideas and Solutions for America's Problems

Where are all of the *ideas* concerning how to fix our nation's problems? We have all of those politicians up there in Washington and yet we never hear about any ideas that are coming from them concerning how to fix what's wrong with America. Why? God knows it's not for a lack of problems; we've got a boatload of them. I guess maybe it's a lack of creative thinking on their part? Maybe it's the lack of will, which is necessary in order to implement these ideas? Perhaps the major changes, which our country so desperately needs, are just too drastic? Our gummed-up, broken system would not be able to implement them or adapt to them?

All I know is that we need ideas, we need change, and we need it soon; before it's too late.

I mentioned an important idea for real change in an earlier paper: term limits. As of now, a U. S. senator serves a six-year term of office. With term limits, a senator would be allowed to serve two, and only two, terms. Twelve years is enough. I think we should also allow a U. S. representative to serve a four year term, rather than the current two year term; and they should be allowed, again, to serve only two terms. Eight years is enough for them. Their current two-year terms are, today, I think, too short. As it is now, by the time they get to Washington it's time for them to plan their re-election campaigns, and that's just ridiculous. They need to have time to work their office, not to begin planning another run for their office. The president, of course, is already bound, by the U. S. Constitution, to serving a limit of two four-year terms (i.e., eight years).

One of the biggest political/financial levers that the federal government in Washington now uses in order to manipulate the states into doing their will is the federal highway monies that they give to the states. If a particular state doesn't like a new federal program and if they refuse to support this federal program, then the feds simply threaten to cut-off the state's federal highway monies. This always works, and the feds always get what they want. Bush used this tactic to push through his pathetic "No Child Left Behind" education agen-

da, which many states, at first, rejected; but they needed that highway money and eventually caved-in. (A side note here: I just recently talked with a friend of mine who has been teaching a high school student how to read, because the school this student attends hadn't done so. Thanks feds.) We can remove this federal highway money lever by simply nationalizing all U. S. and interstate highways, because these are *interstate*, as opposed to *intrastate*, highways. Let the state's take care for their own highways (i.e., intrastate) and let the feds take care of their own highways (i.e., interstate). It doesn't take an Einstein to figure this one out, does it?

Federal civil service workers are supposed to be civil servants, not lower party members. This means that if you want to work for the federal government you should want to serve your country; sort of like serving in the military. You don't join the military, and you shouldn't work for the federal government, so that you can get [ten paid holidays per year](#); federal workers should get the same days off as the rest of us, who work for private businesses, get (more like four or five paid days-off). Federal workers, now, are getting paid to stay home from work on Columbus Day, which is this coming Monday, for crying out loud. This kind of thing has to stop. Not to mention the leave time, sick days, and vacation time that they get. (As an aside, did anyone happen to notice that the federal government has been shut down for the past three days, due to heavy snow fall in Washington? I didn't. My life wasn't affected by this shut down whatsoever. As far as I'm concerned the federal government could be shut down on a virtually permanently basis and no one would even notice.)

Federal civil servants should be paid a low-end salary, not the high-end salaries which they are currently receiving. No more [six-figure salaries](#) for civil servants, and no more bonuses either. The truth is, about eighty percent of federal "workers" need to be given the pink slip; laid off, for good.

What about U. S. foreign policy? This one is so simple, yet we have so many foreign policy issues that are now affecting our nation; even the safety of its citizens. Talk to almost any American today and they will all tell you the same thing: "We just need to butt-out of everyone else's business. Just leave those people over there alone." This one doesn't take an Einstein to figure out either, does it?

Our nation should do the right thing: support nations that treat their citizens and their neighbors justly, and oppose nations that treat their citizens and their neighbors unjustly.

Israel? [Stop supporting it](#). Overnight, the entire Muslim world love us, because we would finally be on the right side of this issue and we would no longer give the (accurate) impression that we are hypocrites. What would happen to the jihadist terrorist threat we now (supposedly) face? It would end, immediately.

I'll ask you this: If the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King were still alive, would he be a supporter of Israel or of the oppressed Palestinian peoples? Dr. King said:

"One has not only a legal but a moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. I would agree with St. Augustine that "an unjust law is no law at all. . . Now, what is the difference between the two? How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust? A just law is a man-made code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law. *Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distort the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority.*" ([Letter from Birmingham Jail](#), emphasis added).

In other words, he would support the Palestinian peoples. I miss Dr. King; he was smart, and he had courage too: a true *leader*.

What about international trade issues? What needs to change, for the better? This one is very simple too: stop allowing China to flood our nation with cheap goods; now. China, today, is doing the same thing to America that England did to post-colonial America: [flooding it](#) with cheap goods. This needs to stop, and America needs to re-build its manufacturing base. This will create jobs for *us*, rather than jobs for *the Chinese*. Again, we don't need a genius to solve this problem; we only need the backbone to correct it.

These are only a few, simple ideas that we can use in order to solve our nation's problems. My question is: Why are these ideas not coming from Washington? Answer: Because Washington is a large part of the problem.



## Polarized Nation:

# Why We Must Unite and How We Can Accomplish It

We hear so much about a divided and polarized America these days, and it's true—we are divided and we are polarized—but we never hear about our need to come together—to unite—and how this can be accomplished . And we never hear about this because very few—if any—of our social/political leaders have the slightest idea about how to go about uniting a society as factious as ours has now become.

I wrote a paper a while back (*Political Musings*; October, 2009) in which I outlined how a social/political revolutionary movement must make proper use of its nation's symbolic political imagery, which represents the nation's social/political ideology, in order for it to be successful. This is a truth so obvious that it should not have to be outlined at all, yet many people are unaware of the importance of this fundamental truth.

I also mentioned, in the same paper, the climate of fear—a fear that some people, out of frustration, will resort to acts of political violence—that existed at that time and which continues to exist today. Since that time we have seen the [shooting at Fort Hood](#), the man who [crashed a small airplane into an IRS](#), and, most recently, the [Pentagon](#). The second incident—the guy who crashed a small plane into an IRS building—was, I think, an example of exactly the type of violent acts that people were growing concerned about: violent acts that are committed by people, because they have become frustrated with the current political system.

I read, online, [the diatribe](#) written by this fifty-something year old plane-crasher-murderer guy and, I have to say, this guys was an idiot. His diatribe, in a nutshell, says “the government is screwing me out of my money!” My response to this is: “Yeah, no shit. You’re fifty-something years old and you’re just now waking up to this fact?! And your solution is to kill innocent people by crashing an airplane into a building!?” This guy was not just an idiot, he was a murderous idiot.

I was on facebook the day this happened, and I received a link to this guy's diatribe, which was sent to me (on facebook) by the Chicago Tribune (via [Scribd](#)), and one of my more radical facebook friends made a post saying that what this guy had done was good: a symbolic act of political violence committed against a broken and oppressive government. My response to her was to quote from this guy's diatribe, wherein he had said "Not only is violence the answer, violence is the only answer" and I pointed out to her that not only is what this guy *did* wrong but *his statement* was also wrong: violence is *not* the only answer, and violent acts which take the lives of innocent peoples are *always* wrong.

It is obvious that people are frustrated, that people have become factionalized, and that this nation, politically, has become extremely polarized. The question is: What can we do in order to remedy this situation? Under what traditional American principles can we unite?

Well, what would you prefer to hear first; the *good* news or the *bad* news? If you're like me, I always prefer to hear the bad news first; because, this way, I still have the good news to cheer me up afterward, right?

The bad news is that some people's sacred cows will have to be sacrificed in order to gain the unity our society so desperately needs, politically speaking. The good news is that in order to unify our society, politically speaking, we simply need to return to our nation's traditional and most fundamental principles, which all Americans (should) hold in common.

I recently wrote an extensive paper of this subject ([\*Broken Government: A Call To Action\*](#); February 2010), which was actually a follow-up to my earlier paper ([\*Political Musings\*](#); October, 2009), which will reward a careful reading. It is not my intention, here, to re-write something I have already written elsewhere but to flesh-out the ideas I have previously outlined and work-out more of their details.

America has certain, unique, and fundamental principles that cannot be ignored without losing everything that we hold dear about our nation: liberty, freedom, individual rights (e.g., life, property) and the protections of those rights. These are fundamental principles—enshrined in the [\*Declaration of Independence\*](#) and the [\*U. S.\*](#)—upon which all American can, or should, agree. I say should, because not all Americans agree with these principles as fundamental sociopolitical realities. Many American, in fact, do not understand—at the philosophical level—these principles, nor do they understand why these principles are so fundamental to America's very being, or existence—at the ontological level.

I don't expect most Americans to know these things; not at the philosophical level anyway. What I *do* expect is for America's *social and political leaders* to know these things—at the philosophical and

ontological level. (The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, for example, knew these things, which is why his sociopolitical civil rights movement was successful.)

But where are such leaders, today? Not in the White House; not in Congress; not on television . . . and God knows, if you're not on television these day you simply don't exist (i.e., *I'm televised; therefore I exist*).

I'll give you a very simple example of just how broken, at the philosophical level—our nation currently is and just how wrong-headed our nation's current political “leadership” actually is. You know who the current Vice President of the United States of America is, right? Joseph Biden? Well, I remember something about Joe Biden that he would probably prefer that I'd have forgotten by now: his criticisms, back during the early 1990's, of United States Supreme Court justice nominee (now sitting Justice) Clarence Thomas.

At the philosophical level, Joe Biden doesn't support America's fundamental, foundational principle, which guarantees our individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: natural law.

And neither do most (all?) of our so-called “leaders” in Washington. So I'm thinking, “What the hell is Joe Biden's problem (with natural law)? Just who in the hell does he think he is anyway?” Natural law is the foundational, philosophical principle upon which the Founders of this nation based all of our rights, and Biden et al *take issue* with this principle? What? They would refuse, today, to *sign* the Declaration of Independence? Who in the hell do these guys think they are? They think they're wiser than the Founders of this nation were? Hmm, I don't think so; *not by a long shot*. In fact, people like Biden—who deny natural law—are just the opposite: they are fools. More like *Demolitionists* of this great nation than they are *Founders*.

As I said, this is just one, important example of just off-track—at the philosophical level—our nation has gotten. This rejection of natural law—by Biden and most others—has been going on for many, many years now. This undermining of natural law has been the legal basis for denuding the Bill of Rights: our rights no longer come from nature and nature's God (natural law), they now come from men in high government places (positive law) and this is how our government has been taking them away.

Think about it: if men and governments *give us* our rights, then men and governments can also *take away* those same rights, which is exactly what's been happening. But if our rights come from nature and nature's God then they are *inalienable* rights, which men and governments can *never* take away.

Which do you prefer? This philosophical and legal problem in American needs to be fixed, soon, before we have no rights left to us at all.

Think about it like this, our nation was like a house that was built upon a rock (i.e., natural law) and it withstood, for many years, the storms which blew against it. Then, slowly, over time, a group of people convinced (i.e., lied to) the owners of the house (i.e., the People) and got them to agree to move their house from one place, which was upon a rock (i.e., [natural law](#)), to another place, which was upon sand (i.e., [positive law](#)). (You've probably seen, at some time or another, those guys who will actually lift an entire house and [transport](#) it from one place to another.)

Well, after a while, as the storms continued to beat upon this house, the house began to break apart and collapse, because it had been moved from its (formerly) solid foundation—the rock—to its present foundation: sand.

“Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it” (Matthew 7: 24-27).

The People have been putting up with this for far too long now. The people of this nation—especially the Christian people, who believe in natural law, as the Founders did—need to unite and set things right. It's time to set things right, to put America back upon its proper, legal and philosophical track. If we fail to do so, we will be allowing those fools in Washington to continue demolishing our nation. Do we think those [criminals/politicians](#) in Washington are better than we are, even though they have proven—[repeatedly](#)—they are not? Will we continue to sit back and do nothing while they continue to [ruin our nation's economy](#), continue to get our children killed in [distant foreign](#), and continue to drive us toward [a greater war](#), which could actually threaten the very security of our homes and our lives [here in America](#)?

Will we do nothing? Or will we begin setting things right, as we should have done long ago? Well, I told you that someone's sacred cows were going to be sacrificed, didn't I?

Those who look to the government for hand-outs (bail-outs?) are in for some bad news: America, philosophically, was never intended to have a federal government that would bail us out, or provide us with health-care, or pay us farm subsidies, or send us a retirement check, or *pay us for anything*; nor was ever intended to collect in-

come (and the many other) taxes in order to be able to do so. These sorts of things, which we have so gotten used to—like a heroin addict who gets used to his fix—were not born upon the American philosophical soil of individual liberty and freedom but were born upon the sandy soils of philosophically foreign lands: communism and socialism.

Does this mean that someone who is an American citizen does not have the right to espouse a communist or socialist philosophy? That such a person should be considered un-American for doing so? No! If someone wishes to work toward building a philosophically socialistic and communistic-based government here in America I say: “Go ahead and try to do so, if you wish. And good luck with that, *because you’re going to need it.*”

America—historically and philosophically—acknowledges *the truth*: that our rights derive from nature and from nature’s God. The Founders intended us to have a government that insured the protection of our inalienable, God-given rights; and this protection of our rights is what allows us, our families, our friends, and our communities to help others if and when they need our help, because we wish to do the right thing (i.e., helping others) out of the goodness of our hearts and out of obedience to Christ’s command to love our neighbors.

If someone wants to espouse a communist or socialist alternative—a system wherein people have their money taken from them by the government and then distributed to those whom the government thinks are more deserving of that money—I say, “Good luck trying to get the American people, who value liberty and freedom, to buy into such a coercive system as that.” Why attempt to reconstruct our national house upon the sand, which has already proven its instability (as a philosophical foundation) instead of constructing it upon the rock which our Founders *knew* was the only sure foundation upon which to built a nation of liberty and freedom?

The sociopolitical philosophies of communism and socialism do not contain the elements of individual liberties and freedoms, which are founded upon natural law and are enshrined within our nation’s founding documents: the Declaration of Independence and the U. S. Constitution. And it is for this reason that a communist or socialist revolution could never succeed in this nation. These foreign philosophies have been smuggled into our government and into our society, in the name of helping others who are less fortunate, but such foreign philosophies are now, finally, being discovered for what they really are: communist and socialist utopian counterfeits of Christ’s earthly kingdom of love and compassion, which can only be brought about by his love and his grace—and not by government coercion.

And behold, a lawyer stood up to put him to the test, saying, "Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" He said to him, "What is written in the law? How do you read?" And he answered, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all your mind; and your neighbor as yourself." And he said to him, "You have answered right; do this, and you will live." But he, desiring to justify himself, said to Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?" Jesus replied, "A man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell among robbers, who stripped him and beat him, and departed, leaving him half dead. Now by chance a priest was going down that road; and when he saw him he passed by on the other side. So likewise a Levite, when he came to the place and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a Samaritan, as he journeyed, came to where he was; and when he saw him, he had compassion, and went to him and bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine; then he set him on his own beast and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. And the next day he took out two denarii and gave them to the innkeeper, saying, 'Take care of him; and whatever more you spend, I will repay you when I come back.' Which of these three, do you think, proved neighbor to the man who fell among the robbers?" He said, "The one who showed mercy on him." And Jesus said to him, "Go and do likewise." (Luke 10: 25-37)

## Natural Law and the Right to Life

In a previous essay, I brought up (current Vice President of the United States) [Joe Biden](#) of (current U. S. Supreme Court Justice) Clarence Thomas' [belief](#) in natural law during Thomas' [confirmation hearings](#) during the early 1990's. There is one reason—and one reason only—for Biden's being so critical of Thomas' [belief in natural law](#): the fear that Thomas, as a U. S. Supreme Court Justice, would vote to overturn Roe v. Wade, thus [recriminalizing](#) abortion on demand.

I'm going to tell you, now, about a person encounter that I once had with an abortionist. And, as much as I hate to say it, this is the rather disturbing *truth* about abortionists.

In 2003 a friend of mine, [Leon Holmes](#), was [nominated](#), by then president George W. Bush, to the judiciary of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas. I attended a meeting of angry liberals who were opposed to (then president) Bush's nominations to the federal judiciary, which was held in downtown Little Rock, Arkansas at the University of Arkansas' [William Bowen School of Law](#).

During this liberal bitch-fest, a man who was sitting behind me shouted out, "What are we going to do about Leon Holmes?!" After the meeting adjourned I turned to the man and asked him, "So what's your problem with Leon Holmes?" He said, "[He's pro-life](#)" and I said, "So what's wrong with that? What are you, [pro-abortion](#)?" He said, "Yes, actually I used to be an abortionist." I said, "What did you do, graduate at the bottom of your class in medical school?" He said, "How did you know?" I said, "It just figures . . . if you're lousy at healing people then you're probably a lot better at killing them."

This is the disturbing [truth](#) about abortion on demand: the back-alley butchers have simply moved—legally—onto Main Street.

And this is exactly my problem with abortion on demand: the *legality* of it. Some women will always seek abortions; just as some jealous, angry husbands will always seek out their cheating spouse's lover in order to kill him. But this doesn't mean that the state (i.e., the government) should legalize such killings.

As far as I'm concerned, if a woman wants to hire someone to kill her unborn child, she should have to find an abortionist who's hiding-out in a back-alley somewhere , because she's got no business being

able finding an abortionist right out in the open—operating like a McDonald's or a Wal-Mart—on Main Street.

The U. S. Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade decision was made upon a very sketchy legal premise: a right to privacy, which is not explicitly stated but was “discovered” to exist, in the Fourteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution. And this decision mandates—contrary to state laws prohibiting abortion on demand—the legality of abortion on demand in all fifty states, contrary to the Tenth Amendment. In fact, if the abortion issue had not been removed from the political arena to the courts, it would be left up to the people of each state and their elected representatives to decide the issue, as it should have been. As things stand now, abortion on demand is available in every state, regardless of the peoples of the fifty states feel about abortion on demand (think: McAbortion or Wal-Abortion here).

The Declaration of Independence, which is based upon natural law, as I have previously pointed out, grants us the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness:

“We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness . . .”

The Declaration of Independence reveals the Founder’s legal and philosophical presuppositions: all people are *created* equally and they are *endowed by their Creator* with certain *inalienable* rights. The right to life being first and foremost, yet the unborn child—thanks to positive law—no longer enjoys this right.

As I’ve said elsewhere, this is just one, important example of just off-track—at the philosophical level—our nation has gotten. This rejection of natural law—by Biden and most others—has been going on for many, many years now. This undermining of natural law has been the legal basis for denuding the Bill of Rights: our rights no longer come from nature and nature’s God (natural law), they now come from men in high government places (positive law) and this is how our government has been taking them away.

Think about it: if men and governments *give us* our rights, then men and governments can also *take away* those same rights, which is exactly what’s been happening. But if our rights come from nature and nature’s God then they are *inalienable* rights, which men and governments can *never* take away. Which do you prefer?

Another personal story, concerning the same liberal bitch-fest I mentioned earlier, which, again, took place in 2003 at the William Bowen School of Law. After the meeting had adjourned, I spoke with a woman who was an attorney, having gotten her degree in law from the

University of Chicago, and I asked her, “In the context of the abortion debate, would you say that human—meaning the unborn child’s—rights trump women’s rights? Or would you say that women’s rights trump human rights?” She said, “Women’s rights trump human rights.”

What I didn’t say to her, because I didn’t feel like getting into an argument with her, was that if women’s rights trump human rights then men’s rights can certainly trump women’s rights. In other words, once we reject God-given natural law and natural rights and replace these with man-given positive law and government-given rights, *men can take away those rights whenever and for whatever reason they decide to do so*. I’d really like you to think about that, okay?

I’d really like you to think about this too: Since Dr. King’s crusade against segregation was based upon natural law—as found in America’s founding documents—what do you think happens to his crusade when we reject natural law for positive law? That’s right: white people’s rights can trump black people’s rights. And I *really* don’t think we want to go *there*, do we?



## The Peril of Perverted Political Perceptions

I don't watch the news. Do you know *why* I don't watch the new? Because I would be like most of the people who *do* watch the news: I would miss the big picture. You've heard the old saying: "You can't see the forest for the trees" right? Well, that's the problem with everyone who is caught up in the news and everyone who is caught-up with the goings on in Washington: They are so focused on petty, bullshit issues they don't realize that the very destruction of this nation itself is at stake. I catch enough news from the radio, a newspaper, or a magazine so that I can get the big picture; and the big picture is all I need to know.

Most Americans have a perilously perverted political perception, which is (potentially) fatal. I say "potentially" because I believe it's still possible for the American people to regain control of their government, but I also believe we have very little time left in order to do so. We don't have until the next election. I liken the current situation in the Middle East to our playing with matches in a barn full of hay: it could go up in flames any minute.

In an earlier post ([Washington](#), February 10, 2010) I referred to Washington politicians as snakes, and I need to apologize for doing so . . . to the snakes not the politicians.

Snakes aren't liars, nor are they evil; and it's not their fault that they slither in order to get around. But those politicians up there in Washington *are liars*, and they *are evil*. How else would you describe them? The worst lie they tell is that America is at war. But are we? Terrorism, by its very nature, is a phenomenon that is impossible to make war against. Terrorism is a violent and symbolic tactic, which is used by individuals and small cell-groups of individuals, in order to cause chaos and disorder within a powerful governmental order that cannot be defeated by means of conventional warfare. So how the hell does *a nation* wage a war against *individuals*? It can't, and we aren't: we are waging war against *nations* (e.g., Iraq, Afghanistan, and (perhaps even) Iran).

Our government suspects individuals to be terrorists; it suspects each of us—U. S. citizens—to be terrorists, until we can prove that we are not. President Obama has authorized the assassinations of individual in the name of the “War on Terror”, but again: how does a nation wage war against individuals? What, pray tell, would happen to a U. S. citizen who had the audacity to say that Obama should be targeted for assassination? Oh my God! The Secret Service would be on their doorstep wouldn't they? How dare they say such a thing! This is beyond the pale! It's okay for the president to authorize assassinating individual U. S. citizens but don't even *think* about it being okay for a U. S. citizen to assassinate the president of the United States. I, for one, find it almost unbelievable that the president of the United States has authorized the assassination of individual U. S. citizens. I say “almost” because this has actually been going on for a long time now; Obama simply re-authorized this criminal Bush era policy, in the name of the so-called “War on Terror”.

Who do these Washington politicians think they are? Demigods? Do they actually expect us to bow to their will, no matter what? They have to blow their noses and shit just like the rest of us do, right? Are they *better* than we are? Are we just supposed to shut our eyes to what is really going on, and to what has *been* going on for a long, long time now? Regan; Bush I; Clinton; Bush II; Obama—*what the hell is the difference*?! Someone please tell me, because I don't see any difference: they are all liars, snakes (sorry snakes), and hypocrites—evil hypocrites and liars who lie to us everything, especially about *why* we are at war with terrorism. Do you know *why* we are at war with terrorism? Because Israel is having difficulties stealing Palestine from the Palestinians; and because the people who support Israel are also big supporters (= \$) of Washington politicians (e.g., Goldman Sachs). Those Washington politicians are much better at raising money the American people. And I, for one, am not going to stand aside doing nothing while they smash the ship of state on the shoals of their stupidity.

So what are most Americans doing while our politicians in Washington are misguidedly plotting and planning to win (I) World War III? They're watching propagandistic images and listening to propagandistic sound-bites (i.e., the news) or watching and listening to stupid reality shows on television. Not to mention the fact that they are also eating too much while they do so. How can anyone think clearly when their bellies are full of junk food and their minds are full of crap? They can't; and they don't. Even those who *think* they care about this nation, because they pay attention to what's going on in the world of Washington politics, are so focused on petty bullshit issues (i.e., *the trees*) that they fail to see the big picture (i.e., *the forest*): Our government is *ruined* and our so-called “leaders”—who have deluded

themselves into believing their own lies—are *leading us to destruction.*

It's time to put a stop to it, now; is it not?

I liken the current political/governmental situation in America to a drunken driver who is behind the wheel of a car—along with you, me, our friends, and our families in the back seat of the car he's driving. The Washington politicians are like the drunk driver: they're careening all over the road—shitfaced drunk—with all of us in the back seat of the car. And we're doing . . . what?

NOTHING!

Why?! Are we just going to let them *kill us?*! Are we *really that* apathetic?! Do we actually care more about our reality television shows (or whatever) than we do the safety of our own families and our friends?!

If you and your family were in the back seat of a car that was being driven by a drunken driver, wouldn't you throw that bastard out and take control of the vehicle yourself; before he killed everyone? But I do understand *why* we're not doing anything to stop him, it's because we know that he will be stopping, soon, and we're hoping that a more sober driver will take the wheel. We think the next election will give us better politicians; but what we fail to realize is that, while the drunken driver behind the wheel *does* plan on stopping, soon, he's only stopping for one reason: *to buy more liquor.*

Do you see the analogy here? The next election in America will change NOTHING.

Our government is *broken*, but it is *not* beyond repair. The foundation of America is *sound*, and perhaps (maybe) the walls; but *everything else* needs to be torn down and rebuilt.

So I'll ask you, again: What would you do if you, your family, and your friends were in the back seat of a car that was being driven by a drunken driver; knowing that when he stops he's only stopping to buy more liquor? What would you do? Just sit there, doing nothing? Or would you punch him in the mouth, throw him out of the car, and take the control of the vehicle yourself? I would *hope* that you would punch him in the mouth, throw him out, and drive the car yourself. Since your life and the lives of your family and your friends are at stake, I would *hope* that you would do the right thing.

As things stand now, the Washington politicians have bankrupted our economy, leaving us *hanging out to dry*—economically speaking—and now they are *careening us into World War III*, leaving us *hanging out to fry*—existentially speaking—and we are doing *nothing* to stop them?! Are you kidding me?! Go ahead, sit in the back seat of the car

and watch Fox News or CNN; go ahead sit there and filling your face and watching stupid reality shows. Go ahead and enjoy yourselves. You'd better enjoy yourselves *while you can* because—while you're filling your bellies with food and filling your minds with garbage—God is preparing to judge this nation for its evil deeds—unless we do an about-face (i.e., repent of our evil and begin doing good)—SOON.

As they say: “the wheels of God”.

It's high time the American people wake up and begin standing up for themselves and for their families. And it's high time the American people stand up for what is right. The American people need to march on Washington and *demand* that our government cease from doing evil and begin doing what is good, soon; before it's too late.

This, as I see it, is the *only* hope we have.

## America, Its Enemies, and God's Judgment

I wonder how Americans can eat at all, considering the fact that Israel has been blockading Gaza, Palestine for over three years now. The children of Gaza cannot get the food, water and medicines that they so desperately need . . . yet Americans are virtually oblivious to this fact. Worse yet, the American people are, through their tax dollars, *supporting* this blockade. Even *worse*, American Christians support Israel in *everything* that it does—including the murder of innocent children—erroneously believing that God is with Israel.

### If Americans . . .

Israel—with the support of the U. S.—has imposed this blockade upon Gaza, Palestine for the past three years now—which is not a *tragedy* but a crime. As American citizens, especially as *Christian* American citizens, my question is: Are we even aware of this fact? And if we are: Do we care about the fact that children as a result of this blockade?

The United Nations (and the world) says that the Israeli blockade of Gaza is a crime and I agree. Do you?

God; he is against Israel. And he is also against the U. S. so long as we continue to support Israel.

Israel and the U. S. continue their run-up to World War III and Americans continue to ignore the severity of the situation. Russia is furious with us for using NATO, which was designed as a purely *defensive* organization, as an *offensive force*—first in Kosovo and now in Afghanistan. The Russians are giving weapons to Iran as well as warning the U. S. not to attack Iran.

Russia, China, and Iran have been allies for many years and it is foolish for the U. S. to go to war with them over oil and Israel. Our politicians in Washington—who are unable to get even the most trivial governmental business done—are, however, doing a bang-up job at putting the lives and homes of the American people. These “leaders” actually believe that they can win a World War III against China, Russia, and Iran, et al.

They are fools; and so are we—if we allow them to do this.

We have no excuse for being unaware of these facts and events. And God is holding us—the American people—responsible. He will not buy the “but we didn’t know” excuse . . .

*“Rescue those who are being taken away to death; hold back those who are stumbling to the slaughter. If you say, ‘Behold, we did not know this’, does not he who weighs the heart perceive it? Does not he who keeps watch over your soul know it, and will he not re-quit man according to his work?” (Proverbs 24:11-12)*

Did you get that? If we say that “we did not know . . .” God, who weighs the human heart, perceives that we *did* know and that we did *nothing* to rescue those who were being slaughtered.

And slaughter is the only appropriate word for what the Israelis are doing to the Palestinian peoples, especially in Gaza: first they wall them in and then they kill them. It’s like shooting fish in a barrel—with U. S. rockets. Israel pulverizes people, buries innocent, and we support it? And American Christians think that God? Have they lost their minds, or just their hearts?

The other day a friend of my suggested that I lighten up; that I stop posting videos having to do with Israel’s slaughter of little Palestinian children. But how can I? And why should I? If Americans would simply turn off their televisions, which never show any videos or images of murdered Palestinian children, and would, instead, simply Google images of “dead Palestinian” they would see this horrible truth for themselves then I wouldn’t have to post them, right? But Americans don’t seem to know, because I guess they’re just too busy to be interested in anyone besides themselves (and their own health care); or perhaps they simply don’t care at all; or, if they do care, they probably think there’s nothing they can do about it anyway so why should they bother looking at such disturbing images—“out of sight out of mind”, right?

But there is something we can do about it. There is a way for the U. S. to stop supporting Israel and its slaughter of innocents: march on Washington

I’m told that the American people will never do this; that we’re too apathetic. Okay, fine. But, if that’s going to be the case, then God will judge us for turning a blind eye to this slaughter of innocents. America is already under threat of God’s judgment, due to the fact that we have legalized the slaughter of innocent in America for the past forty years (i.e., abortion on demand). Just how much blood do you think the body of a three month old pre-born child contains anyway, maybe

a pint or two? Multiply that amount by 49,000,000—which is actually *a little less than* [the number](#) of pre-born babies that have been legally aborted in America, since ([legally sketchy](#)) the 1973 Roe v. Wade decision—and you get *a lot* of innocent blood that's been shed—on American soil.

Where do you think all of that innocent blood goes when the abortionists kill those little pre-born babies anyway? I'll tell you: into the sewers that run beneath your cities; *that's where*.

Where do you think all the innocent blood of those little Palestinian children, killed by the Israelis in Gaza goes? Not into the sewers, because they don't have such first-world luxuries as sewers: it flows onto the [streets](#) and into the ground.

Innocent blood, according to the Bible, cries out to God from the ground (see [Genesis 4:10](#)).

And Christians in American believe that God supports Israel and therefore *we* should support Israel as well? Are they kidding me? Have these Christians read their Bibles lately? Jesus, speaking to the hypocritical Jewish Pharisees, said:

“You snakes! You brood of vipers! How will you escape being condemned to hell? Therefore I am sending you prophets and wise men and teachers. Some of them you will kill and crucify; others you will flog in your synagogues and pursue from town to town. And so upon you will come all the righteous blood that has been shed on earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah son of Berekiyah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar. I tell you the truth, all this will come upon this generation.

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you who kill the prophets and stone those sent to you, how often I have longed to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, but you were not willing. Look, your house is left to you desolate. For I tell you, you will not see me again until you say, ‘Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.’” (Matthew 23:33-39).”

Did you catch that? God has left Israel's house *desolate* (Greek: [aphietai](#); meaning: *left alone*, or *abandoned* by God).

Wake up America! Wake up American Christians! Let us march on Washington and demand that our “leaders” do the right thing: Stop supporting Israel!

Before God's judgment falls upon us; before our “leaders” in Washington get us all killed.

God will use our (and Israel's) enemies to punish us for our sins if we do not repent of them—by forcing Washington to do a foreign policy about-face. Because by allowing a sinful, unrepentant nation's

enemies to defeat that nation in battle is how God judges and punishes nations— like Israel—who forget God and do evil:

*Jerusalem remembers  
in the days of her affliction and bitterness  
all the precious things  
that were hers from days of old.*

*When her people fell into the hand of the foe,  
and there was none to help her,  
the foe gloated over her,  
mocking at her downfall.*

*Jerusalem sinned grievously,  
therefore she became filthy;  
all who honored her despise her,  
for they have seen her nakedness;  
yea, she herself groans,  
and turns her face away.*

*Her uncleanness was in her skirts;  
she took no thought of her doom;  
therefore her fall is terrible,  
she has no comforter.*

*“O LORD, behold my affliction,  
for the enemy has triumphed!”*

[Lamentations 1:7-9](#)

## Israel Did Not Keep God's Covenant; That's Why the Land is Not Theirs.

“For I know that after my [Moses’] death you [Israel] will surely act corruptly, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you; and in the days to come evil will befall you, because you will do what is evil in the sight of the LORD, provoking him to anger through the work of your hands.” (Deuteronomy 31:29)

... [A]nd you shall be plucked off the land which you are entering to take possession of it. And the LORD will scatter you among all peoples, from one end of the earth to the other. . . (Deuteronomy 28:63-64)

“In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes.” (Judges 21:25)

The people of Israel did *not* fulfill their covenantal agreement with the LORD; therefore they have *never* been entitled to inherit the land that the LORD promised to them.

It's as simple as that.

When God gave Israel the Law, he knew they would not keep it; he knew they would fail to uphold their end of the covenant (see: Deuteronomy 28:63-64). Why, then, did God give the people of Israel the law to begin with? Why did he bind them to obey that which they could not keep?

St. Paul tells us that “Law came in, to increase the trespass; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, so that, as sin reigned in death, grace also might reign through righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Romans 5:20-21).

The law came to reveal our sinfulness. Jesus Christ came, died, and rose again from the dead in order to save us from our sins; by grace.

When St. Paul was confronted by Jewish Christians who believed that the Gentile Christians were required to keep the Law of Moses in order to be saved, he told them:

“Now therefore why do you make trial of God by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as they will” (Acts 15:10-11).

Neither Jew nor Gentile Christians can keep the Law; they never could and they never can. We strive to follow Christ, to love our neighbors (and our enemies) as ourselves, but we will always fall short of the mark (i.e., sin). The people of Israel are *not* entitled to the land of Palestine *because they failed to keep God's commandments*. They were not simply required to possess the land, they were required to *live according to the Law*, which they *failed*, miserably, to do.

How, then, can Christians—Gentile Christians—support the modern nation of Israel and its brutal slaughter of the Palestinian peoples? Is this how we are to love our neighbors? Is this how we are to love our enemies?

Christians, Muslims, and Jews have differing beliefs concerning God, but none of these three faiths sanction the murderous oppression of innocent peoples. Israel's slaughter of innocent civilians in Palestine—especially Gaza, which is a walled-in, blockaded concentration camp with no place for innocent civilians to hide—is *morally wrong*; as are the American Christians who support Israel; as is the U. S., because it supports (and arms) Israel.

God will be our Judge.

The blood of innocent Palestinian children is upon the hands of all Christians, especially American evangelical Christians, who support Israel's murderous oppression of the Palestinian peoples, and their innocent blood cries out to God from the ground, upon which it was spilled, for vengeance.

God will avenge the blood of these innocents; you can count on that, because God HATES those who shed innocent blood:

“There are six things which the Lord hates, seven which are an abomination to him: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that devises wicked plans, feet that make

haste to run to evil, a false witness who breathes out lies, and a man who sows discord among brothers" (Proverbs 6:16-19).



## America, Symbolism, and Revolution

All well established political/governmental orders, including—especially—the United States of America, understand power, as well as the power of symbolism—their own political/governmental power having been established, long ago, and enshrined in enduring, symbolic forms (e.g., flags, seals, monuments, songs, myths). These orders will always cover their own acts of political violence with this cloak of political symbolism.

Any revolutionary movement within a well established political/governmental order should be built upon the established order's own political power and political symbolism whenever possible. If, for example, the established order has overstepped its bounds of authority—as the government of the United States has today—and become broken beyond all normal means or repair, but still retains a good, solid philosophical/political basis, what is needed is a revolution which can restore that order to its former historical and philosophical principles.

For example, the U. S. was not an interventionist and colonizing nation, as it is today, until the time of the Spanish American War, during 1898. From the end of the Revolutionary War in 1783 until 1898, America minded its own business and did not intervene in the affairs of foreign nations nor did it attempt to colonize or set up puppet regimes in other nations as it does today, especially in the Middle East.

Here in the U. S., any revolutionary movement that hopes for success would be wise to cloak both their speech and their actions with the political symbolism which represents that which grounds the established order both historically and philosophically because it is the established order's traditional and historical political philosophy which the revolutionary movement desires to see restored.

The Left has never had success with its revolutionary political speech and acts here in the U. S. because its political philosophy has no ties to traditional, historical U. S. political philosophy. The right to private property, for example, is enshrined in the Declaration of Independence; but revolutionary Leftists believe the notion of private

property should be abolished; a belief which is, in fact, central to the Left's communist/socialist political philosophy.

Any successful restorative revolution or reformation of American government must be based upon a return to America's politically violent beginnings, its early political symbolism, and the political philosophy upon which it was based.

In a previous essay ([Political Musings](#); October, 2009), I outlined how a social/political revolutionary movement must make proper use of its nation's symbolic political imagery, which represents the nation's social/political ideology, in order for it to be successful. This is a truth so obvious that it should not have to be outlined at all, yet many people are unaware of the importance of this fundamental truth.

America has certain, unique, and fundamental principles that cannot be ignored without losing everything that we hold dear about our nation: liberty, freedom, individual rights (e.g., life, property) and the protections of those rights. These are fundamental principles—enshrined in the [Declaration of Independence](#) and the [U. S.](#)—upon which all Americans can, or should, agree. I say should, because not all Americans agree with these principles as fundamental sociopolitical realities. Many Americans, in fact, do not understand—at the philosophical level—these principles, nor do they understand why these principles are so fundamental to America's very being, or existence—at the ontological level.

I don't expect most Americans to know these things; not at the philosophical level anyway. What I *do* expect is for America's *social and political leaders* to know these things—at the philosophical and ontological level. (The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, for example, [knew these things](#), which is why his sociopolitical civil rights movement was successful.)

The Declaration of Independence, which is based upon [natural law](#), as I have [previously](#) pointed out, grants us the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness:

“We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.  
..”

The Declaration of Independence reveals the Founder's legal and philosophical presuppositions: all people are *created* equally and they are *endowed by their Creator* with certain *inalienable* rights.

As I've said [elsewhere](#), this is just one, important example of just off-track—at the philosophical level—our nation has gotten. This rejection of natural law has been going on for many, many years now.

This undermining of natural law has been the legal basis for denuding the Bill of Rights: our rights no longer come from nature and nature's God ([natural law](#)), they now come from men in high government places ([positive law](#)) and this is how our government has been taking them away.

Think about it: if men and governments *give us* our rights, then men and governments can also *take away* those same rights, which is exactly what's been happening. But if our rights come from nature and nature's God then they are *inalienable* rights, which men and governments can *never* take away.

Which do you prefer?

In America, this natural law philosophy, which is enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, is the only philosophical basis that a social revolution, if it wishes to be successful, can have. All others will fail.

For example, the federal government recently passed a law which makes it mandatory for every American to purchase of health care and it will impose a fine upon those who do not wish to do so. This, for many Americans, has become the last straw, which has broken the camel's back. Our rights, which are outlined for us in both the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights have been [trampled upon and gradually taken away from us](#) over the course of many years. Many Americans today, I believe, have finally had enough.

If the federal government, and the peoples who support its ongoing socialist agenda, wish to continue the erasure of individual freedom, liberties, rights, and property then they had better start being honest with the American people: Go down to the National Archives and remove the Declaration of Independence and the U. S. Constitution, with its Bill of Rights, throw them in the trash (or publicly burn them), and replace these documents with a new Declaration, Constitution and Bill of Rights. I can't wait to see just what style of man-based rights that our government now wishes to give us. And which rights it wishes to take away from us.



## U. S.-Backed Israeli Terrorism

What's the difference between children who are going hungry and without the medicines they need because they live in some impoverished land somewhere and children who are going hungry and without the medicines they need *because their land is being blockaded by a powerful nation*—with the backing and support of the United States of America?

You may have guessed the answer to this: the first scenario is *a tragedy* whereas the second scenario is *a crime*.

Israel, with the support of the U. S., has imposed a [blockade](#) upon Gaza, Palestine for the past three years now, which is not a tragedy—it is a [moral evil](#).

As an American citizen, especially if you are a *Christian* American citizen, my question is: Are you even aware of this fact? And if you are: Do you care about the fact that children are suffering as a result of this blockade?

The United Nations, in the link provided above, says that the Israeli blockade of Gaza is a [crime](#) and I agree. Do you?

I understand that most people in America, especially most Christians in America, think of the Palestinians as terrorists who kill Israelis, but *the truth* is that the Palestinians weren't bothering anyone until Jewish settlers, who were a part of the [Zionist](#) Movement, began taking over the land of Palestine; beginning in [1700](#) and continuing to this very day.

What many American citizens, especially Christians, don't realize is that *the modern nation we think of as Israel was born out of terrorism*: Jewish, Zionist terrorism which was directed against . . . the British.

The year 1946 saw the birth of the modern nation of Israel, and Israel has one man, in particular, to thank for the important role which he played in creating the modern nation of Israel: the Zionist

terrorist leader [Menachem Begin](#), who went on to become Israel's sixth Prime Minister.

Begin was the leader of the Zionist Israeli terrorist group the [Irgun](#). From the end of the First World War (1917) until the founding of the modern nation of Israel (1946) the land of Palestine, which is what it was called, was under the protection of the British as a British Protectorate. The Zionists were determined to drive the British out of the land of Palestine so that they could establish the nation of Israel and rule the land for themselves. The violent, murderous act of terrorism which finally succeeded in driving the British out of Palestine occurred when the Zionist terrorist group, the Irgun, which was led by future Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, was the [bombing](#) of the King David Hotel (in Jerusalem) on July 22, 1946, killing 91 people and injuring many others.

#### THIS IS HOW THE MODERN NATION OF ISRAEL WAS FOUNDED: UPON BRUTAL, VIOLENT ACTS OF TERRORISM.

And Israel, today, has *the gall* to say that *the Palestinians* are the guilty parties in all of this? Israel has *the nerve* to say that *Hamas* is a terrorist organization? What about *the Zionists* and *the Irgun* . . . WHO STARTED THE WHOLE DAMN THING?!

The Israeli-Palestinian issue is not one of senseless hatreds and endless retaliations, it is an issue of: *who started what and when did they start it?* In other words: who, in the beginning, *did the wrong thing*? And the answer to this question is that *the Zionists* were the ones who first imposed themselves upon the Palestinians, *the Zionists* were the ones who first occupied and began to settle in the land of Palestine in order to turn Palestine into *a Jewish homeland* by *driving out* the Palestinians. And it was *the Zionists* who, in order to accomplish this act of international thievery, USED TERRORISM in order to *drive* the British *out* of Palestine.

And we wonder why the Palestinians are so angry? Why *they* resort to terrorism?

Please.

And *now* Israel is *blockading* Gaza; starving and shooting little Palestinian children; burying them beneath the rubble of their own homes?

Cowards!

Criminals!

Terrorists!

Read your history Americans! Read your history American Christians! Read your history lovers of Israel! Open your eyes and SEE what's really been going on all of these years.

Israel will reap what it has sown; God will not be mocked; and the blood who have been murdered by the Israelis *will* be avenged.

The United States of American, because of its continued support of the Israelis and the nation of Israel, will *also* reap what it's sown; and you can add to that the innocent of over 49,000,000 babies, who have been "legally" executed in their mother's wombs in America, since 1973.



## Why Do People Follow Osama bin Laden and Join al Qaeda?

Why do people follow Osama bin Laden? Could it be that they see him as expressing what they themselves believe? Could it be that what Osama bin Laden says has an element of truth to it, which Americans fail to see, and that what he says simply makes a lot of sense to some people?

I think the answer to these questions is undoubtedly: Yes; what Osama bin Laden says *does* make a lot of sense to some people and these same people also see him as someone who can articulate—well—that which they themselves believe.

I vehemently despise the taking of innocent human life—life is precious—and I believe that those who intentionally take innocent lives through acts of murder, terrorism, and war should be prosecuted for their horrendous crimes. But I can also appreciate Osama bin Laden’s positions and his arguments, and I can also admire him, his cause, and the dedication he has to that cause.

Osama bin Laden and his followers are strict adherents of a specific, Arabian sect of ([Sunni](#)) Islam known as [Wahhabism](#), which takes its name from its founder: [Muhammad](#), who believed and taught that the [Qur'an](#) and the [sayings](#) and [life](#) of the prophet of [Islam](#) (i.e., [Muhammad](#)) should be adhered to quite literally.

Most Muslims, however—being human—don’t like this literal application of the Qur'an and the life of the Prophet Muhammad; any more than most Christians—being human—like a literal application of the [New Testament](#) and the [life-example](#) of Christ. Most believers—whether Islamic or Christian—prefer doing *as little as possible* in order to gain eternal life; despite what the founders of their (respective) religions have said.

Osama bin Laden and the Wahhabists believe they should take the teachings of the Qur'an and the life-example of the Prophet Muhammad very seriously; and I greatly respect them for doing so. Likewise, I, too, take the teachings of the New Testament and the life-example

of Christ very seriously. So, Osama bin Laden and I do have something important in common: we are both believers whose actions are based upon our beliefs, which we take very seriously.

We have many other things in common as well, such as the belief that it's wrong for the U. S. to put its military forces in Arabia; that it's wrong for the U. S. to prop-up the current regime of the House of Saud in Saudi Arabia; that it's wrong for the U. S. to invade and occupy Muslim lands which, traditionally, have been a part of the Ottoman Empire—until the end of World War I—for hundreds of years (1299–1923); and that it's wrong for the U. S. to support the Zionist and its murderous of the Palestinian peoples.

Actually, I probably have more in common with Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda than I do with most Americans—including, especially, American Christians—except for his/their wanton, murderous disregard for innocent human lives, which I detest. And that, of course, is the deal-breaker with me. If I were going to blow up a building—as a symbolic act of political violence—I would at least phone ahead in order warn everyone to get out of the building *before* I set off the bomb. This is what the old Irish Republican Army often did and the symbolic, political statement they wanted to make was still made yet no innocent people were killed in the process. In truth, I don't like the use of bombs in acts of political violence anyway; because they are just too dangerous and someone can easily—and unintentionally—be harmed by them (i.e., there's no such thing as an explosives expert).

Unlike most Americans, I've seen many people die a violent death—including someone who was killed in an explosion. Perhaps this is why I have such a great appreciation for life, and perhaps this is also why I so detest the heartless taking of innocent human lives? (I suppose we'd have to ask a psychiatrist about this . . .)

So, while we love to demonize Osama bin Laden, he is—to some people—the spokesman of their beliefs and a man to be admired. A point once made by Osama bin Laden, which really resonates with me, was the accusation of terrorism he once made against America regarding our treatment of the Japanese peoples during World War II. And I'm not talking here about the concentration camps many Japanese-Americans were interred within, which is bad enough, rather, I'm speaking about America's *decimation* of two, large Japanese cities (i.e., Hiroshima and Nagasaki), which incinerated tens of thousands of innocent men, women, and children.

I think Osama bin Laden makes a valid point here. Does he not?

Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda believe they are justified in killing innocent Americans and Israelis *because we struck the first blows*—

by killing innocent Iraqis (during the [Gulf War](#)) and [Palestinians](#) respectively.

Al Qaeda was *never* a [threat](#) to the U. S. *until that time* (i.e., 1990) and al Qaeda will *cease* to be a threat *the moment we decide to do the right thing*: leave the Muslim world to sort-out its own problems; stop our support of Israel; and apologize to the Muslim world for what we've done to it. In other words, America needs to come clean and [repent](#) of its [evil](#) and its [hypocrisy](#).

If we say that we believe in justice, liberty, and freedom for all who are [oppressed](#); and if we say that we believe it is wrong to take innocent human lives, then we need to start *acting* like it.

Until then, people like Osama bin Laden, his followers, and myself will continue to call America to account for [the evil](#) and the evil we [continue to do](#) unto this very day—with [no foreseeable end](#) in sight.



## On Protesting Abortion

*“Do you remember how you felt after 9/11? When all of those innocent people, over 3,000 of them, were killed in that vicious act of political violence? Do you remember how you felt seeing the posters of the loved ones who were missing? It broke my heart, and I’m sure it broke yours too. Well, I feel exactly the same way about the 4,000 babies who are viciously killed in abortion clinics every day throughout America. It’s shameful, it’s disgusting, and I don’t understand why more people’s hearts aren’t broken by it.”*

A.J. MacDonald, Jr.

*“The Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no justice. He saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no one to intervene...” (Isaiah 59:15-16).*

Non-violent sit-in style protests were outlawed for the first time in America in 1994, when the U.S. Congress passed the [Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act](#). Antiabortion activists who were practicing sit-in protests in order to block the entrances of abortion clinics—who were being removed, cited, and fined around \$100.00 for trespassing—were, after passage of the F.A.C.E. Act in 1994, subject to a \$10,000 fine and six months in federal prison for their first offense.

The large scale, effectual, non-violent sit-in protests engaged in by the antiabortion group [Operation Rescue](#) is what led to the passage of the F.A.C.E. Act. The group would peacefully block clinic entrances in order to shut down the abortion clinics’ baby-killing business.

Having grown up during the late sixties and early seventies, I was very familiar with non-violent sit-in style protests. They were a common protest tactic during those years, engaged in both by civil rights activists and anti-war protesters. Passive resistance was thought to be a better tactic than violence.

The F.A.C.E. Act was passed in order to curb incidents of anti-abortion violence, which were rising at the time, but the new law also [squelched](#) the traditional, non-violent sit-in protests as well. No anti-abortion protester who had obligations (like having a family and hav-

ing bills to pay) could afford the new cost of peacefully blocking an abortion clinic's entrance (\$10,000 and six months in federal prison).

This new law effectively shut down the serious and very effective non-violent protests, leaving only two other options: peaceful protests that wouldn't interfere with the abortionist's baby-killing business and the violent protests that would. Both kinds of protests continue to this day, but the non-violent sit-in protests, which were so effective, have all but ceased.

The controversy over abortion continues to this day because the issue was removed from the political arena to the courts. Had the abortion issue been left up to the voters of each state, as it should have been, the issue never would have become as volatile as it has. If the people of New York had wanted to legalize abortion in their state, then that would have been their business; and if the people of Kansas had wanted abortion to remain illegal in their state, then that would have been their business too. As it stands now, and as it's stood for more than thirty years, abortion on demand is required, by a ([legally sketchy](#)) U.S. Supreme Court decision, to be legally available throughout the land (think McAbortion or Wal-Abortion here) regardless of what *the people* of the various states might want, because the U.S. Supreme Court says that this is the right thing to do.

But killing a child before it is born is never the right thing to do, regardless of who says that it is.

The goal of Operation Rescue's non-violent sit-in style protests was to put the abortion clinics out of business; if not permanently, then at least for a few days. As I said in a previous post below, when I first heard that [late-term](#) abortionist specialist [George Tiller](#) of Wichita, Kansas had been killed—gunned down in his “church”—I was surprised; I didn't realize his clinic was still open and that he was still in the baby-killing business. But now his clinic is closed; probably for good. And he is no longer practicing or [profiting](#) from his bloody trade. (Tiller's “church” is no longer profiting from his bloody trade either, if he was contributing to it financially.)

There is an important, if unsettling, political lesson to be learned from this: violence works.

I am opposed to [violence](#) (from the Latin: *violentus*, meaning: to violate). But I am not opposed to what I would consider the use of [force](#) (from the Latin: *fortis*, meaning: *strong*) to defend innocent human lives. In regard to abortion in America, I believe some measure of force would be legitimate only after all legal and non-violent means available to protect those innocent human lives had first been completely and totally exhausted. I would consider the use of *deadly* force an ultimate—something-to-be-avoided-at-all-costs—last resort, to be used only the direst of circumstances. Regarding abortion in America, I don't think we've reached these direst of circumstances yet,

although the circumstances surrounding late-term abortion specialist George Tiller probably came closest to it. I, for one, was not the least bit saddened by news of Tiller's death; he was, after all, in the death business.

You might think I'm employing a bit of semantics by making a distinction between violence and force, but I'm not. Think about it. A police officer who guns down someone who is threatening to kill an innocent person uses *force*, not violence. Likewise, when someone is threatening to kill (or is in the act of killing) an innocent person and no legally authorized person is able to stop them—for whatever reasons, but especially, in regard to abortion, after all legal and non-violent means to stop them have been completely and totally exhausted—the (unauthorized) private individual who uses force to stop them is using *force*, not violence.

*Violence* is what is perpetrated on the innocent in America every day—around 4,000 times each day.

Do you remember how you felt after 9/11? When all those innocent people, over 3,000 of them, were killed in that vicious act of political violence? Do you remember how you felt seeing the posters of the loved ones who were missing? It broke my heart, and I'm sure it broke yours too. Well, I feel exactly the same way about the 4,000 babies who are viciously killed in abortion clinics every day throughout America. It's shameful, it's disgusting, and I don't understand why more people's hearts aren't broken by it. We have truly become a nation without a heart and without a soul. And any nation that destroys its posterity doesn't deserve to have posterity.

*“God has taken his place in the divine council; in the midst of the gods he holds judgment: “How long will you judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked? Give justice to the weak and the fatherless; maintain the right of the afflicted and the destitute. Rescue the weak and the needy; deliver them from the hand of the wicked.” They have neither knowledge nor understanding, they walk about in darkness; all the foundations of the earth are shaken. “You are gods, sons of the Most High, all of you; nevertheless, you shall die like men, and fall like any prince.” Arise, O God, judge the earth; for to thee belong all the nations!” (Psalm 82)*

*“For if you truly amend your ways and your doings, if you truly execute justice one with another, if you do not oppress the alien, the fatherless or the widow, or shed innocent blood in this place, and if you do not go after other gods to your own hurt, then I will let you dwell in this place, in the land that I gave of old to your fathers forever.”* (Jeremiah 7:5)

*"Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save, or his ear dull, that it cannot hear; but your iniquities have made a separation between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you so that he does not hear. For your hands are defiled with blood and your fingers with iniquity; your lips have spoken lies, your tongue mutters wickedness. No one enters suit justly, no one goes to law honestly; they rely on empty pleas, they speak lies, they conceive mischief and bring forth iniquity. They hatch adders' eggs, they weave the spider's web; he who eats their eggs dies, and from one which is crushed a viper is hatched. Their webs will not serve as clothing; men will not cover themselves with what they make. Their works are works of iniquity, and deeds of violence are in their hands. Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood; their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity, desolation and destruction are in their highways. The way of peace they know not, and there is no justice in their paths; they have made their roads crooked, no one who goes in them knows peace. Therefore justice is far from us, and righteousness does not overtake us; we look for light, and behold, darkness, and for brightness, but we walk in gloom. We grope for the wall like the blind, we grope like those who have no eyes; we stumble at noon as in the twilight, among those in full vigor we are like dead men. We all growl like bears, we moan and moan like doves; we look for justice, but there is none; for salvation, but it is far from us. For our transgressions are multiplied before thee, and our sins testify against us; for our transgressions are with us, and we know our iniquities: transgressing, and denying the Lord, and turning away from following our God, speaking oppression and revolt, conceiving and uttering from the heart lying words. Justice is turned back, and righteousness stands afar off; for truth has fallen in the public squares, and uprightness cannot enter. Truth is lacking, and he who departs from evil makes himself a prey. The Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no justice. He saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no one to intervene; then his own arm brought him victory, and his righteousness upheld him. He put on righteousness as a breastplate, and a helmet of salvation upon his head; he put on garments of vengeance for clothing, and wrapped himself in fury as a mantle. According to their deeds, so will he repay, wrath to his adversaries, requital to his enemies; to the coastlands he will render requital. So they shall fear the name of the Lord from the west, and his glory from the rising of the sun; for he will come like a rushing stream, which the wind of the Lord drives. "And he will come to Zion as Redeemer, to those in Jacob who turn from transgression, says the Lord. "And as for me, this is my covenant with them, says the Lord: my spirit which is upon you, and my words which I have put in your mouth, shall not depart out of*

*your mouth, or out of the mouth of your children, or out of the mouth of your children's children, says the Lord, from this time forth and forevermore.”* (Isaiah:59)



# Hasn't a U. S. Airliner Already Been Brought Down By Terrorists?

With all of the hoopla surrounding the so-called “[underwear bomber](#)” you would think that more people might be aware of the fact that *a fully loaded 747 airliner has already been blown out of the U. S. skies by Al Qaeda terrorists.*

You don’t believe me? Perhaps you don’t remember the particular incident about which I am speaking? Or maybe you remember it, but you’ve never really cared enough about it to study it? I’ll admit, it’s a lot easier to simply believe what the government and the media tell us, that’s for sure, but, if you do remember this incident at all (as I do), you will remember just how shady the whole thing was—even in the mainstream media—at the time it occurred.

I’m talking about [TWA flight 800](#), which went down, mysteriously, just after departing JFK airport (Long Island, New York) on July 17, 1996 killing all 230 persons on board (including [an entire high school French Club](#)—killing sixteen teenaged students and five adults—from Pennsylvania, who were on their way to Paris).

At the time, many people nearby witnessed what appeared to be a missile streaking toward the doomed airliner, as was reported by the mainstream media at the time. And there is a very [good](#) about this, which I’ve read, but I simply don’t believe that a missile is what took that airliner down.

I agree with investigative journalist [Peter Lance](#), who has written [three books](#) referencing the TWA flight 800 incident (in the broader context of his overall investigation of 9/11); the third of which I am currently reading, having already read his first two books. (Before you think I’m a crackpot, I will ask you: “Have you bothered to read his books? Do you even care enough to read them?” Lance is a first-rate—five-time Emmy Award winning—investigative reporter and, I assure you, he’s no kook).

Lance makes a very good case, showing that [TWA flight 800](#), who planted a small bomb near the center fuel tanks of the jumbo jet, in order to cause a mistrial in the federal case, which was being prosecuted at the time of the TWA flight 800 incident, of the infamous Al Qaeda bomber/terrorist [Ramzi Yousef](#)(remember him?), who had planned and executed the *first* attack on the World Trade Center (how many people even remember *that* anymore?) as well for as what was known as “[Operation Bojinka](#)” (i.e., the terrorist plot to take down multiple airliners, virtually simultaneously, via small (liquid) bombs, placed near the airliner’s center fuel tanks, over the Pacific).

Is any of this ringing a bell with you? Do you remember any of this at all? I’ll admit, it’s very easy to forget, and it’s also very disturbing to think about.

If you do care, I would suggest that you begin by reading Lance’s books; especially his book on 9/11: [\*Cover Up: What the Government Is Still Hiding About the War on Terror.\*](#)

Even at the risk of being thought a kook, I think I’ll do a post (soon) concerning the largest unsolved mass-murder in U. S. history: [9/11](#).

If someone that you loved had died on TWA flight 800 on July 17, 1996—or in either of the World Trade Center towers on September 11, 2001—would you really believe, so easily, what the government and the media have told you about these incidents?

I wonder.....

## Days of Deceit: 12/7 and 9/11

The number one issue facing America and the world today, which must be faced down by the People (i.e., the citizens) of the United States of America, is the so-called “War of Terror”. This includes, especially, the on-going wars in Iraq, a belligerent U. S., continuing U. S. support, eavesdropping on U. S. citizens, assassination of U. S. citizens overseas, and the suspension of due process of law for U. S. citizens who are suspected of being terrorists amongst (many) other things. In short, the current U. S. government is conducting what amounts to a never-ending belligerent and war-making attitude toward those nations that it perceives to be its enemies and the establishment of a police here at home.

Many Americans have bought into the Washington government’s concept that the “War on Terror” is keeping us safer. Although Americans run virtually no risk whatsoever of ever being killed in a terrorist attack, they continue to believe that they (or someone they love) are truly in danger of being killed in such an attack.

Most Americans were not endangered by the 9/11 attacks, nor did most Americans lose someone whom they loved on that fateful day. These many Americans also, seemingly, accept the Washington government’s official account of what happened that day. However, those who *were* endangered on 9/11 and those *did* lose someone whom they loved on that fateful day *do not as easily accept* the Washington government’s account of what happened on the day of 9/11.

Question: “If you had lost someone whom you loved on 9/11, would you still as easily accept the Washington government’s official account of what happened on that day?”

I bring up 9/11 for a reason: our government is still, to this day, telling us that the reason for our troops (and al Qaeda), whom our government says is solely responsible for the terrorist attacks of 9/11. The fact of the matter is that U. S. Special Forces *had* Osama bin Laden, trapped at his cave complex at Tora Bora, Afghanistan, *in December 2001* and they were instructed by our government in Washington to allow him to flee into Pakistan *at that time*. As you might imagine, once bin Laden was surrounded by U. S. Special Forces in

Afghanistan, it was impossible that U. S. forces could not have apprehended him as he was fleeing to Pakistan and toward freedom.

Our government in Washington did this for one reason: So that, for the past nine years, they could say that we were “still on the hunt” for bin Laden. This, however, is beyond belief: the Special Forces know how to do their job; and they did their job *two months after 9/11*, which is just about how long one would expect for them to take in order to get that particular job done.

I read a book, a few years ago, about the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, [Day of Deceit: The Truth About FDR and Pearl Harbor](#), and in the book, the author, Robert Stinnett, proves—conclusively—that our government in Washington intentionally withheld (from the base commander of Pearl Harbor) [information](#) that could have prevented the tremendous loss of 2,390 American lives from that attack. [Stinnett](#) who served in World War II and concludes his book by saying something to the effect of, and I’m paraphrasing here, that “Although it breaks my heart to say this, our government in Washington allowed those men to be killed in order to have an excuse to enter World War II.”

What most people fail to realize is that our government in Washington, especially the military and intelligence services, uses a [deontological](#) moral reasoning. For one who is aware of this type of moral reasoning, in which the rightness of an action is determined by the amount of *greater good* this action brings to the world, it is easy to see how our government—or any government—can cause or allow the deaths of nearly 3,000 souls (e.g., 12/07 and 9/11) in order to bring about the *greater good* of making the world [safe for democracy](#).

What first tipped me off that something was wrong, and that our government in Washington wasn’t telling the truth, was the attack on the Pentagon on the day of 9/11. It was said that a commercial airliner, a Boeing 757, had crashed into the side of the Pentagon, yet there was no visible wreckage of the aircraft on site. The fact that a commercial airliner could hit the side of the Pentagon, which is made of [reinforced concrete](#), and leave virtually [no trace of its existence](#) simply strained my credulity. For example, the aircraft’s tail section—the most durable section of any commercial jetliner—was missing from all photos of the crash site that I was seeing on television that day. Another fact that tipped me off that day: the section of the Pentagon that was hit was under construction and mostly unoccupied. (A side note here: I had a friend at the time, who, on 9/11, was working, in intelligence, at the Pentagon. She, like Rumsfeld, was in the side of the building *opposite* the impact.)

Many months after 9/11, I was surprised by the Washington government’s release of (very brief) video footage of the attack on the Pentagon. What surprised me was that the [fireball](#) in the video, which

was caused by the impact, is clearly the result of high explosives and not aircraft fuel. I realize that many, if not most, Americans are unfamiliar with high explosives, but a simple comparison of the photos of the [aircraft hitting the World Trade Towers](#) to the photos of the explosion at the Pentagon, show obvious dissimilarities.

My question to you is this: “If our government in Washington—for the greater good of what it perceived to be the creation of a safer world—was responsible for the deaths of nearly three thousand American citizens on September 11, 2001, would you really want to know?”

If you DO want to know, I suggest that you begin your investigation here:

[History Commons](#)

[Global Research: 9/11](#)

[9/11](#)

[9/11](#)



# My Review of Peter Lance's Book: *Triple Cross*

## (Or "How Much Did the FBI Know Before 9/11?")

This is my review of Peter Lance's latest book [\*Triple Cross: How bin Laden\*](#). Peter Lance—a five-time Emmy award-winning investigative journalist—has, in *Triple Cross*, provided us with yet another eye-opening exposé of the U. S. government's multiple “failures” to prevent the terrorist attacks of 9/11. (This is Lance's *third* book on this subject; his first two being: [\*1,000 Years for Revenge\*](#) and [\*Cover-Up\*](#).)

In *Triple Cross*, Lance chronicles the saga of a man you may, once or twice, have heard snippets about, in the media, but who, for all practical purposes, has *never* been mentioned in connection with 9/11 or with any of the other al Qaeda-related terror attacks (e.g., the U.S.S. *Cole* bombing and the U. S. embassy bombings in Africa).

I pick-up snippets about this guy on the news, once or twice, and, I must say, after hearing what little I did manage to hear about this guy, he certainly peaked my interest. This man was a former Egyptian military officer and highly trained Egyptian military commando who would take leave from his active duty service with the U. S. Army, while assigned to the JFK Special Warfare Center in Ft. Bragg, North Carolina, in order to travel to Afghanistan to help his Muslim brothers fight the Soviets, during the late 1980's.

Have you ever heard of this guy? His name is Ali Mohamed, and Peter Lance has done one hell of a job digging up the truth about him, his terrorist activities, and his long-standing relationship with the FBI, which dates back to 1992, when Ali began working for the FBI as a Foreign Counter Intelligence agent. The question Lance asks (and answers) in *Triple Cross* is: *What did the FBI know and when did they know it?*

Here's just a brief list of what the FBI knew and when they knew it:

- They knew Ali Mohamed was training al-Qaeda terrorists in New York in 1992.
- They knew about the al Qaeda cell that planned and executed the *first* attack on the World Trade Center (i.e., the [bombing](#) of the WTC in 1993) *before* it happened.
- They knew that Ali Mohamed traveled to Nairobi, Kenya in order to do surveillance on the U. S. embassy located there in preparation for a future al Qaeda terrorist attack (the [bombing](#) of which actually occurred in 1998, killing 213 people).
- They knew Ali Mohamed traveled to Khartoum, Sudan, in 1993, in order to arrange a terror summit between (Sunni) al Qaeda and (Shiite) Hezbollah leaders, including Osama bin Laden, which led to the Khobar Towers [bombing](#) (Saudi Arabia) in 1996, and facilitated the future Sunni-Shiite insurgency alliance in Iraq (2003).
- They knew, in 1993, that Ali Mohamed was training al-Qaeda terrorists how to hijack commercial airliners.
- They knew, in 1995, that terror mastermind [Ramzi Yousef](#), and his uncle, [Khalid Sheikh Mohamed](#), were planning to use airliners as missiles; plotting to hijack and then [crash](#) commercial airliners into buildings (e.g., the Transamerica building, the Sears Tower, the Pentagon, and the World Trade Center towers) in the U. S.

- They knew, in 1995, that terror mastermind Ramzi Yousef, and his uncle, Khalid Sheikh Mohamed, were planning to blow up a dozen airliners over the Pacific by using small, easily concealed, liquid-based, time-activated bombs, which were to be placed near the center fuel tanks of Boeing 747's, causing the airliners' fuel (and the airliner itself) to explode.
- They knew, in 1995, that Ali Mohamed had gotten Ayman al-Zawahiri (al Qaeda's number-two man) into the U. S. for an al Qaeda fundraising tour; the purpose of which was to raise funds for the bombing of the Egyptian embassy in Pakistan.

  

- They knew that Oklahoma City bomber Terry Nichols had been in contact with al Qaeda members in the Philippines *before* the bombing of the Murrah federal building on April 19, 1995.

  

- They knew al Qaeda was planning to blow up a U. S. airliner, via a small, liquid-based, time-activated bomb, which was to be placed near the center fuel tank of a Boeing 747 (in order to cause a mistrial) during terror mastermind Ramzi Yousef's federal trial in New York City, during July 1996. (This event actually *did* occur, when TWA flight 800 blew up in mid-air just after taking off (bound for Paris, France) from JFK International airport (Long Island, New York) on July 17, 1996, killing all 230 people on-board; including an entire high school French Club, from Pennsylvania, who were on their way to Paris; killing sixteen students and five adults).

  

- They knew of, and were monitoring, the al Qaeda cell (in Africa) that was plotting to bomb, simultaneously, the U. S. embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania in 1998 (killing 224 people and injuring thousands) *before* it happened.
- They knew, during late 1999-early 2000, that al Qaeda held a meeting (in the Philippines) to plan the execution of

terror mastermind Ramzi Yousef's (9/11 style) airliners-as-missiles plot.

- They knew, in 2000, that two of the 9/11 hijackers had entered the U. S. and that they were [living](#) in a room they had rented from an FBI informant in San Diego, California.
- They knew of, and were monitoring, in 2000, at least four of the 9/11 hijackers who were then living in the U. S., including lead hijacker Mohamed Atta, whose picture was also included in a [link chart](#), which was produced by Defense Intelligence Agency analysts (the results of a vast data-mining project which they had developed).

Suffice it to say that [Peter Lance](#) has done one hell of a job uncovering *the truth* concerning what the FBI knew about the 9/11 terror plot and exactly when they knew it.

Many people are simply unaware of the fact that government law-enforcement agencies, like the FBI, aren't caught off-guard very often, especially when it comes to large-scale terrorist attacks. They are well aware of those groups who are plotting acts of terror—they monitor and infiltrate these groups in order to control them and to control the situation. Sadly, what many people fail to realize is that governments often have plans (or laws) that they wish to implement in order for them to be better able to control the general population, and that often they require an event—a [crisis](#)—to occur before these plans (laws) can be implemented.

The FBI and its handling of intelligence before 9/11 indicates, to me, that the U. S. government was seeking a crisis of epic proportion in order to implement its plans to invade the Middle East and to pass new, draconian laws (i.e., the [USA Patriot Act](#)) so that they might better control the general population.

I highly recommend this book, which is now Lance's *third* book on this subject. As Lance says, at the end of [Triple Cross](#):

"For the sake of Ronnie Bucca, Louie Garcia's good friend, and for the sake of every man, woman, and child who died that day, the cold case of 9/11 needs to be [reopened](#), and investigated with tenacity and courage. There has never been a crime in the history of this nation that deserves clearance more than the mass murders of September 11, 2001."

I sincerely hope this is my last 9/11 book. I don't want to have to write another one" (Peter Lance, *Triple Cross*; p 483)

You shouldn't have to write another book Peter; you've already written *three* excellent books on the subject. The American people simply need to care enough to read them.



## Jesus and Violence

I was talking with someone the other day, discussing violence—as in anti-abortion violence—and this person said to me (as many people do) that Christians should never do anything violent, because Jesus never did anything violent. I said “You’ve never read the New Testament have you?” They said “No.” This much was obvious to me.

Contrary to popular opinion, all four Gospels record Jesus acting violently; on one, particular occasion:

“And Jesus entered the temple of God and drove out all who sold and bought in the temple, and he overturned the tables of the money-changers and the seats of those who sold pigeons.” (Matthew 21:12)

“And they came to Jerusalem. And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who sold and those who bought in the temple, and he overturned the tables of the money-changers and the seats of those who sold pigeons; and he would not allow anyone to carry anything through the temple. And he taught, and said to them, ‘Is it not written, ‘My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations’? But you have made it a den of robbers’.” (Mark 11:15-17)

“And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who sold, saying to them, ‘It is written, ‘My house shall be a house of prayer’; but you have made it a den of robbers.’” (Luke 19:45-46)

“The Passover of the Jews was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. In the temple he found those who were selling oxen and sheep and pigeons, and the money-changers at their business. And making a whip of cords, he drove them all, with the sheep and oxen, out of the temple; and he poured out the coins of the money-changers and overturned their tables. And he told those who sold the pigeons, ‘Take these things away; you shall not make my Father’s house a house of trade.’ His disciples remembered that it was written, ‘Zeal for thy house will consume me’” (John 2:13-17)

This account, of Christ's cleansing of the temple, is, in John's gospel, especially detailed. According to John, Jesus *took the time* to make "a whip of cords", which he then used to drive the moneychangers from the temple. In other words, he beat these people with it. That sounds violent to me. And that's not all; according to all four gospel accounts (and it's rare for all four gospels to include any one incident so similarly) Jesus also turned over the moneychangers tables; scattering coins and pigeons everywhere. As you may realize, this act, on Jesus' part, is a violent act of property destruction.

"This", I told my friend, "is why I have no problem, as a Christian, with Christians who engage in the violent destruction of abortion clinic properties." "But", said my friend, "it doesn't do any good; the clinics will simply reopen and the abortions will continue just as they had before. Abortion clinic violence never really changes anything, so why even bother?" "So why did Jesus bother? I asked my friend, "No doubt, as soon as he left the temple that day, the moneychangers simply picked up their tables and their pigeons, cared for their wounds (inflicted by Jesus), and went back to business as usual anyway; right?"

So why did Jesus, in this particular case, act in this way? Why the violent behavior? Everyone knows that Jesus taught us that we should turn the other cheek, right?

"You have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.' But I say to you, do not resist one who is evil. But if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also; and if any one would sue you and take your coat, let him have your cloak as well; and if any one forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles. Give to him who begs from you, and do not refuse him who would borrow from you." (Matthew 5:38-42)

Isn't there a serious contradiction here? How can this be? Why didn't Jesus simply leave the moneychangers (who were at the temple that day) alone? Why? Jesus didn't "let it go" because the sin of the moneychangers was an affront, not to the man Christ Jesus himself, personally, but to God, his (our) heavenly Father. And we are to be like Christ: concerning personal insults and injuries, we are to "turn the other cheek", and, whenever necessary, which is very rarely, we are to resist and punish evil-doers when their actions are an affront to God, our heavenly Father.

Abortion, for example, is a direct affront to God, our Creator. It offends his dignity, his majesty, his glory, his moral law, and the laws of nature. Abortion, the legalized killing of little babies, simply because they are unwanted, is a most grievous sin. Such atrocities make a mockery of God and of humanity itself. God will not be mocked, and

legalized abortion on demand cannot be allowed to go unchecked by the Christian community. What kind of world would we be living in if no one ever bothered the abortionists? If no one even made so much as a one-time, violent, symbolic statement for God and for what is right?

Jesus did exactly this, regarding the temple; even though his actions never really changed anything. But what kind of a person would Jesus have been if he *hadn't* done anything about the moneychangers? He wouldn't have been himself, that's for sure. As himself, Jesus did not hesitate to take the time to make a whip of cords, beat the moneychangers out of the temple, turn over their tables, and tell them exactly what they were doing wrong and exactly what God thought of their sin (i.e., he's not at all happy about it).

To my thinking, the abortion issue is a very similar case: let the abortionists know that God is not at all happy with their brutal, bloody actions: abortion is the intentional, violent destruction of the most precious and innocent human lives on the planet. It's shameful; and so is our inaction regarding it.



## Terrorism, Internet Radicalization, and Freedom

We're beginning to hear more and more about internet radicalization these days. We're told by the mainstream media that terrorists are using the internet in order to spread their message of hate and that this is giving rise to a new phenomenon: the radicalized individual, with terrorist sympathies, who could commit a **lone wolf** act of terrorism.

The question the government is asking now is: "[How can we stop this?](#)"

After the indictment of **Jihad Jane** in Philly the other day, the **pentagon shooter** last week, the idiot who **crashed his plane** into an IRS building a few weeks back, and the **Ft. Hood massacre** late last year, the authorities and the media have good reason to be concerned. And I have news for them, and for you: "This situation is far worse than you think."

I'll tell you, and them, something else too: "The government in Washington is **broken** far worse than you think it is, and things are far worse than the mainstream media is letting on."

The mainstream media covered the Tea Party Movement as though it were a serious threat to the established order/regime (meaning: BOTH political parties); but it never was such a threat. Not even close. The Tea Party was a tempest in a teapot. It's true that it was, perhaps, the tip of a much larger iceberg of discontent; but the Tea Party itself never came anywhere close to representing the true level of anger, discontent, and revolutionary spirit that has been rising in this nation for many years now, which is now coming to a head. This revolutionary spirit has given rise to a very large (and growing much larger by

the minute) movement of true revolutionaries, which is made up of good-hearted, intelligent, hard-working, taxpaying citizens on BOTH sides of the political spectrum who are ready for radical, revolutionary change: NOW!

Because they know the next election will change *nothing*.

When both a hard-working, taxpaying **law** and a hard-working, taxpaying **truck driver** are explaining constitutional law to the People, and when both are calling upon the People to take responsibility, **rise up** and **take control** of their broken government, you can *know* that you have a *very serious problem* on your hands. This is no Tea Party Movement; this is a call to revolutionary action.

When the People rise up, take to the streets, and **march against the war** in Iraq and Afghanistan in Washington D. C. on March 20th, demanding an end to this unjust war, people across the country and around the world will see Americans who are Democrats and Republicans, Libertarians and Socialists, Pro-choice and Pro-life, Muslims and Christians, marching to the beat of a single drum: that our government derives its authority from the consent of the governed--the People--and that the People DO NOT consent to this war . . . we've been lied to, and we DEMAND an END to this war: NOW!

We will do whatever it takes to end this **war** and we will take charge of our broken government by ousting the current, **corrupt**, and **criminal** regime and replace it with a new regime, which understands the meaning of freedom, justice and truth; in order to **build a better society**.

So don't be surprised to hear, in the mainstream media, more and more about internet radicalization and angry anti-government talk of revolution, attempting to marginalize true revolutionaries by painting them as kooky internet radicals, or worse: terrorists. Because *the truth* our government doesn't want you to know--and the truth it is afraid of--is this: that these revolutionaries are simply average, everyday, hard-working, taxpaying citizens--who can read, write, and think--who are fed up with this corrupt regime and have decided that they're not going to take it anymore: they're networking, sharing ideas, becoming radicalized, and we're mobilizing.

This is what the current regime is truly afraid of: that **we're coming for them**, that we will **succeed**, and that they will be getting their day in (civilian) court for the **many crimes** that they've committed against the American people.

## Compassion and Imagination

It's difficult for me to imagine, considering how fucked-up the world is, that most people simply don't seem to give a shit about the world or the people in it. I understand that I'm more aware about what's going on and that I'm more sensitive to it than most people are, but still; what the hell does it take for people to be able to see, or to be able to care about their fellows?

I've had my own journey, when it comes to having my eyes opened to the plight of those in the world who are suffering; it's taken me a while to begin seeing, caring, and trying to do whatever I can to help alleviate some of that suffering. But still . . . trying to help people to see what's happening in the world and trying to help people care about the sufferings of others shouldn't be like trying to pull impacted wisdom teeth should it? Don't people, normal people, have a heart? I mean, they're not completely selfish and self-centered are they? I mean, completely? Isn't there some part of them that can be reached, somehow?

I've had my own intellectual and emotional journey in developing a more compassionate attitude toward my fellow man. It wasn't something that happened overnight. And I realize that other people too are (hopefully) on a similar journey. I hope they are anyway, because sometimes I'm really not sure about most people. It seems to me like most of them will never care; no matter how bad things get and no matter how much suffering there is in the world.

I guess it's because they have a very small-minded view of the world; sort of a "me, myself, and I" or an "us four and no more" type attitude.

Lately, considering how bad things have gotten, I'm wondering if people haven't lost their minds—their powers of reason. "Can't you simply see and figure out what's going on?" I ask. Since most of them can't, I wonder, "Have they lost their minds?" But I realize that they've not lost their ability to reason—they've lost their hearts. They have little-to-no compassion. They're too wrapped up in themselves and their own little worlds to care about anyone beyond their own narrow field of vision. And, whenever I do get their attention, they are

filled with self doubt and pessimism; not able to believe that it's possible for anyone to ever be able to do anything that will ever bring about the kinds of change we need in this nation and in the world. And, in a sense, they're right: We never will with *that* attitude.

I can remember when I became a Christian, because it was an eye-opening and paradigm-shifting experience for me: it was early one weekday morning, at around ten o'clock or so, during either May or June of 1985. And that experience didn't occur in a vacuum; I had been raised Catholic, so it's wasn't like I had never heard or thought about Christ until that time—it was a journey—but there was that one, specific moment in time when my old paradigm collapsed and was replaced—by a newer and better paradigm.

So this is what I try to do, when I'm talking to people: help to bring about the shattering of their faulty paradigms; the faulty way in which they view of the world. And I'm not just talking about religious paradigms or worldviews; I'm talking about social and political worldviews too—especially lately.

I think the most important ability one needs to develop, when it comes to being compassionate, it to be able to put yourself in someone else's place. Jesus said that we should, "do unto others as we would have them to do unto you" and that, I think, was the best possible way he could have ever communicated to us *how* we should live our lives: with consideration for others.

Do you ever consider other people? I'm sure that you do, at least those who are close to you. But do you ever consider the thoughts, feelings, and life-situations of people you really don't know, people that you hear about or see in the newspaper, the weekly news magazines, and on television? Do you ever try to put yourselves in their places? Try to feel what they must be feeling? Try to imagine what it must be like to live their life-experience? This, I think, is the key to having compassion: getting outside of ourselves and into the hearts and minds of other people, people who have it a lot worse in life than we do.

Me and my dad used to argue about universal health care, years ago, before it ever became a real issue, like it is now, and I would always say that I couldn't see the sense in the U. S. having what would amount to a universal socialist utopian health care system when many of the people who live right next door to us—our neighbors, the Mexicans—didn't even have sewers, running water, or electricity. Wouldn't it make more sense, I said, for all of us, at least to start with, had sewers, running water, and electricity *first*; and *then* we could begin talking about universal health care, *for everyone*?

How, in good conscience, can any American simply ignore the plight of the people who live right next door to us? Because we don't think about them; we're too busy thinking about ourselves.

It's not that the American people aren't compassionate—my dad was one of the most compassionate people I have ever known, which is why he wanted all American to have affordable health care—it's that our focus is simply too narrow.

I would love to see all Americans have health care, but I would love to see all Mexicans have sewers, running water, and electricity first. I feel guilty enough having sewers, running water, and electricity—knowing that many of my neighbors do not—and I simply can't imagine adding a new health care benefit to that while my neighbors do without all the things we have that we so easily take for granted.

"Out of sight out of mind" seems to be the motto of the selfish, self-centered, and compassionless American. Who cares about the Mexicans: build a wall to keep them out. Who cares about the Palestinians: send Israel more money and more weapons so they can kill more of them. Who cares about the Iraqi and Afghani civilians being killed by U. S. military forces: send more troops and weapons to Iraq and Afghanistan.

But if you ever went to Mexico and saw for yourself what it's like to live there . . . and if you ever went to Gaza, Palestine and saw for yourself what it was like to live there . . . and if you ever saw for yourself what it's like to have to clean up the mess that's left after a stray rocket or shell blows to pieces an Iraqi or Afghani family . . . you might have a different opinion about it. Might you not?

Is that what it takes? Do you actually have to go to these places to see it for yourselves before you will understand? Do you actually have to go to these places to be able to smell the open sewers for yourselves before you will understand? Do you actually have to go to these places for you to be able to hear the people who've lost their loved ones crying in anguish before you will understand? Can you not simply imagine it? Put yourselves in the places of these peoples and simply imagine what it must be like to live life as they live it?

Perhaps this is our problem: a lack of imagination. Well, do me a favor today: try and imagine what it must be like to live as people in other parts of the world live, or even as people in other parts of your city live. Not everyone has it as well as you do, you know. Have a heart; get outside of yourselves for five minutes; and take the time to think about what you can do to make the world a better place—for everyone.



## Resources

Please get involved.

- [American Friends Service Committee](#)
- [American League Against War and Fascism](#)
- [American Peace Mobilization](#)
- [A.N.S.W.E.R.](#)
- [Another Mother For Peace](#)
- [Anti-War Committee](#)
- [Campus Antiwar Network](#)
- [Campaign for Liberty](#)
- [Catholic](#)
- [Catholic](#)
- [Center on Conscience & War](#) (formerly known as NISBCO)
- [Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors](#)
- [The Council for National Interest](#)
- [Code Pink: Women for Peace](#)
- [Common Dreams](#)

- [ChildVoice International](#)
- [DC Anti-War Network](#)
- [Friends Committee on National Legislation](#)
- [GI Rights Network](#)
- [Gold Star Families for Peace](#)
- [Iraq](#)
- [Iraq](#)
- [Long Island Alliance for Peaceful Alternatives](#)
- [Mennonite Central Committee](#)
- [Military Families Speak Out](#) (opposed only to war in Iraq)
- [National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam](#)
- [National War Tax Resistance Coordinating Committee](#)
- [Nevada Shakespeare Company](#)
- [Not in Our Name](#)
- [Peace Action](#)
- [Port Militarization Resistance](#)
- [September Eleventh Families for Peaceful Tomorrows](#)
- [Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee](#)
- [Students for a Democratic Society](#)
- [The World Can't Wait](#)
- [Troops Out Now Coalition](#)

- [United for Peace and Justice](#)
- [Veterans for Peace](#)
- [Vietnam Veterans Against the War](#)



# Index

---

## **9**

9/11 · 12, 32, 36, 82, 84, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 97, 98

---

## **A**

abortion · 20, 54, 55, 56, 63, 82, 83, 84, 100, 101, 102  
 abortionists · 54, 64, 102  
 abuses · 10, 11, 12, 39  
 action · 6, 23, 38, 43, 91, 105  
 activists · 24, 82  
 Adams, John · 29  
 Afghani · 43, 108  
 Afghanistan · 13, 22, 38, 43, 58, 62, 94, 105, 108  
 Africa · 94, 96  
 agitators · 41  
 airliner · 88, 89, 91, 96  
 airliners-as-missiles · 97  
 al Qaeda · 78, 79, 80, 90, 94, 95, 96  
 allied · 23  
 al-Zawahiri, Ayman · 96  
 amendments · 11, 35, 39, 40, 42, 55  
 Americans · 8, 13, 32, 35, 38, 39, 43, 49, 58, 59, 62, 63, 71, 72, 76, 78, 79, 90, 92, 105, 108  
 antiabortion · 82  
 Arabia · 79, 95

aristocrats · 26, 29  
 Arkansas · 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 54  
 assassinate · 27, 59  
 atrocities · 14, 101  
 attack · 13, 62, 89, 90, 91, 95  
 Australia · 23  
 authorities · 19, 104  
 authority · 9, 34, 41, 70, 105  
 axis · 23

---

## **B**

baby · 82, 83  
 basis · 6, 7, 8, 9, 18, 34, 45, 50, 55, 70, 72  
 Begin, Menachem · 75  
 beliefs · 67, 79  
 Biden, Joseph · 50, 54, 55  
 Bill of Rights · 33, 39, 50, 55, 72  
 bin Laden, Osama · 78, 79, 80, 90, 91, 94, 95  
 blockade · 42, 62, 74  
 blood · 63, 64, 67, 76, 84, 85  
 bomber · 88, 89, 96  
 bombs · 79, 89, 96  
 British · 11, 23, 34, 74, 75  
 brutal · 14, 36, 67, 102  
 Bucca, Ronnie · 97  
 Bush, George H. W. · 16, 18, 19, 20  
 Bush, George W. · 16, 20, 21, 54  
 business · 17, 24, 28, 43, 45, 54, 62, 70, 82, 83, 84, 100, 101

---

**C**

Canada · 23  
 Catholic · 3, 107, 110  
 change · 10, 13, 14, 24, 28, 32, 33,  
   39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 60, 105,  
   107  
 chaos · 35, 58  
 children · 24, 51, 62, 63, 64, 67, 74,  
   75, 79, 86  
 China · 6, 12, 13, 22, 23, 32, 33, 36,  
   40, 46, 62  
 Chinese · 23, 46  
 Christ · 3, 22, 52, 66, 67, 78, 79, 101,  
   107  
 Christians · 7, 39, 62, 63, 64, 67, 74,  
   76, 78, 79, 100, 101, 105  
 CIA · 18, 19  
 citizen · 12, 33, 52, 59, 74  
 citizenry · 42  
 citizens · 9, 12, 19, 28, 33, 35, 36,  
   38, 39, 40, 42, 45, 59, 62, 74, 90,  
   92, 105  
 civilians · 67, 108  
 Clinton, Bill · 16, 17, 18, 19, 21  
 CNN · 61  
 cocaine · 16, 18, 19, 21  
 collapse · 51  
 communistic · 52  
 communities · 52  
 compassion · 52, 53, 106, 107  
 compassionate · 14, 28, 106, 107,  
   108  
 conservative · 33, 35, 42  
 control · 12, 33, 35, 36, 41, 58, 60,  
   97, 105  
 corruption · 16, 18, 19, 21  
 court · 105  
 Creator · 8, 9, 14, 29, 55, 71, 101  
 crime · 11, 40, 62, 74, 97  
 crimes · 14, 38, 78, 105  
 criminal · 11, 21, 27, 40, 41, 59, 105  
 crisis · 13, 24, 97

---

**D**

Dar es Salaam, Tanzania · 96  
 death · 17, 21, 42, 63, 66, 79, 84  
 deaths · 91, 92  
*Declaration of Independence* · 8,  
   10, 26, 29, 30, 34, 39, 49, 50, 52,  
   55, 70, 71, 72  
 defense · 23, 41  
 Defense Intelligence Agency  
   (DIA) · 97  
 defenseless · 23  
 Democrats · 28, 35, 105  
 disorder · 32, 35, 58  
 document · 29  
 drunken driver · 60

---

**E**

economy · 28, 51, 60  
 Einstein, Albert · 22, 45  
 electricity · 107, 108  
 elitists · 43  
 emotional · 106  
 enemies · 12, 14, 22, 23, 24, 33, 64,  
   67, 85, 90  
 Escobar, Pablo · 18  
 Evans-Pritchard, Ambrose · 17  
 everyone · 12, 23, 41, 45, 58, 60, 79,  
   107, 108  
 evil · 13, 14, 29, 58, 59, 61, 65, 66,  
   68, 74, 80, 85, 101  
 experience · 10, 16, 107  
 explosion · 79, 92

---

**F**

F.A.C.E. · 82  
 families · 24, 52, 60, 61  
 family · 60, 82, 108  
 farm subsidies · 24, 51  
 FBI · 17, 18, 20, 94, 95, 97

federal · 10, 11, 19, 21, 28, 32, 35, 44, 45, 51, 54, 72, 82, 83, 89, 96  
 federal government · 33, 35, 45  
 federal workers · 11, 45  
 feeling · 34, 107  
 flags · 34, 70  
 Flynn, Vince · 27, 28  
 food · 43, 61, 62  
 foolishness · 51, 62  
 force · 13, 29, 34, 40, 41, 42, 62, 83, 84  
 foreign · 10, 13, 23, 24, 45, 51, 52, 64, 70  
 Foreign Counter Intelligence · 94  
 foreign policy · 13, 23, 24, 45, 64  
 Foster, Vince · 17, 18  
 foundation · 6, 9, 11, 12, 30, 51, 52, 60  
 Founders, of America · 8, 9, 10, 11, 26, 50, 51, 52  
 Fox News · 61  
 France · 23, 96  
 Franklin, Benjamin · 11, 29  
 freedoms · 6, 12, 13, 24, 33, 36, 52  
 friends · 8, 21, 23, 24, 42, 49, 52, 60

---

**G**

garbage · 61  
 Gaza · 24, 62, 63, 64, 67, 74, 75, 108  
 Germany · 23  
 God · 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 29, 42, 44, 46, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 72, 76, 84, 85, 100, 101, 102  
 good · 13, 14, 19, 21, 24, 26, 29, 32, 42, 45, 49, 52, 61, 70, 83, 88, 89, 91, 92, 97, 101, 104, 105, 107  
 Google · 63  
 Gospels · 100  
 government · 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61,

70, 71, 72, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 97, 104, 105  
 grace · 52, 66, 67  
 Great Britain · 3, 23  
 greater good · 91

---

**H**

Haiti · 16, 21  
 Hamas · 75  
 happiness · 8, 9, 13, 14, 29, 39, 50, 55, 71  
 hate · 24, 54, 104  
 health-care · 51  
 heart · 53, 63, 67, 82, 84, 85, 91, 106, 108  
 highways · 44, 45  
 hijack · 95  
 hijackers · 97  
 historical · 34, 70  
 history · 27, 29, 32, 34, 76, 89, 97  
 Holmes, Leon · 54  
 hope · 6, 14, 21, 40, 42, 43, 60, 61, 98, 106  
 hubris · 23  
 human · 7, 9, 24, 29, 41, 46, 56, 63, 78, 79, 80, 83, 102  
 human rights · 56  
 humanity · 7, 14, 101  
 Hutchinson, Asa · 19, 20  
 Hutchinson, Tim · 20, 21  
 hypocrites · 45, 59

---

**I**

ICBM · 22  
 imagery · 6, 48, 71  
 images · 59, 63  
 imagination · 108  
 inalienable · 8, 50, 52, 55, 71, 72  
 individual · 7, 36, 49, 50, 52, 59, 71, 72, 84, 104  
 infringement · 36

innocent · 12, 14, 24, 38, 40, 41, 48, 49, 62, 63, 64, 67, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 102  
innocents · 63, 67  
insurgents · 43  
intelligence · 91, 97  
internet · 104, 105  
Iran · 6, 12, 13, 19, 20, 22, 23, 36, 39, 40, 58, 62  
Iraq · 22, 38, 43, 58, 90, 95, 105, 108, 111  
Iraqi · 43, 108  
Irgun, the · 75  
IRS · 20, 48, 104  
Islam · 78  
Israel · 12, 13, 22, 23, 24, 32, 33, 34, 38, 39, 45, 46, 59, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 74, 75, 76, 80, 108  
Israelis · 24, 33, 63, 64, 74, 76, 79

---

**J**

Jay, John · 29  
Jefferson, Thomas · 29  
Jerusalem · 53, 64, 65, 75, 100  
Jesus · 22, 53, 64, 66, 67, 100, 101, 102, 107  
JFK International (airport) · 96  
journey · 106, 107  
judge · 61, 63, 84  
judgment · 63, 64, 84  
junk food · 59  
justice · 12, 50, 80, 82, 84, 85, 105

---

**K**

Kansas · 83  
Khartoum, Sudan · 95  
King, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther, Jr. · 7, 8, 29, 46, 50, 56, 71, 75

---

**L**

Lance, Peter · 88, 89, 94, 97, 98  
land · 11, 21, 40, 66, 67, 74, 75, 83, 84  
law · 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 20, 26, 39, 40, 41, 46, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 66, 67, 72, 82, 83, 85, 90, 97, 101, 105  
Left · 34, 44, 70  
legal · 7, 8, 9, 46, 50, 51, 55, 71, 72, 83, 84  
Leveritt, Mara · 16, 19  
liars · 58, 59  
liberal · 33, 42, 54, 55  
Libertarians · 105  
liberties · 6, 12, 33, 36, 52, 72  
liberty · 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 29, 39, 40, 49, 50, 52, 55, 71, 80  
life · 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 20, 28, 29, 34, 39, 40, 41, 45, 49, 50, 53, 54, 55, 60, 66, 71, 78, 79, 105, 107, 108  
liquor · 60  
live · 8, 32, 42, 43, 53, 67, 74, 107, 108  
Long Island, New York · 88, 96  
love · 38, 45, 52, 53, 67, 79, 90, 108  
luxuries · 64

---

**M**

magazine · 58  
McDonald's · 55  
media · 17, 26, 88, 89, 94, 104, 105  
men · 8, 9, 18, 26, 29, 50, 55, 56, 64, 71, 72, 79, 84, 85, 91  
Mexico · 108  
Middle East · 12, 22, 23, 24, 58, 70, 97  
military · 14, 22, 23, 34, 39, 45, 79, 91, 94, 108  
mind · 53, 63, 107, 108  
missile · 88  
modern · 33, 34, 35, 39, 67, 74, 75

Mohamed, Ali · 94, 95, 96  
 Mohamed, Khalid Sheikh (a.k.a.  
     "KSM") · 95, 96  
 money · 21, 45, 48, 52, 59, 100, 108  
 monuments · 34, 70  
 Muhammad, Prophet · 78  
 murder · 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 62, 78,  
     89  
 murderous · 24, 39, 48, 67, 75, 79  
 Muslim · 23, 24, 45, 79, 80, 94  
 Muslims · 67, 78, 105  
 Mutually Assured Destruction · 23  
 myths · 34, 70

**N**

Nairobi, Kenya · 95, 96  
 NATO · 13, 14, 62  
 natural law · 6, 7, 8, 9, 46, 50, 51,  
     52, 54, 55, 56, 71, 72  
 nature · 29, 50, 52, 55, 58, 72, 101  
 neighbor · 53  
 neighbors · 45, 52, 67, 107, 108  
 New Testament · 3, 78, 100  
 New Zealand · 23  
 newspaper · 18, 58, 107  
 Nicaragua · 18, 19  
 non-violent · 6, 7, 8, 13, 39, 40, 41,  
     82, 83, 84  
 North Korea · 23, 36  
 North, Oliver · 18  
 nothing · 6, 21, 23, 24, 29, 38, 51,  
     59, 60, 63, 105  
 nuclear · 13, 22, 23, 24

**O**

Obama, Barack · 16  
 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma · 96  
 Operation Rescue · 82, 83  
 oppression · 12, 24, 33, 34, 38, 67,  
     85  
 order · 6, 9, 13, 18, 19, 27, 32, 33,  
     34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 44, 46, 48,

49, 52, 54, 58, 67, 70, 71, 75, 78,  
     79, 82, 89, 91, 94, 95, 96, 97, 104,  
     105  
 others · 7, 41, 50, 52, 55, 64, 72, 75,  
     106, 107

**P**

Palestine · 34, 59, 62, 67, 74, 75, 108  
 Palestinians · 13, 24, 33, 34, 38, 46,  
     63, 64, 67, 75, 79  
 Panama · 18  
 paradigm · 107  
 paradigms · 107  
 Paris, France · 88, 96  
 Parks, Jerry · 17, 21  
 peace · 22, 85  
 Pearl Harbor · 91  
 Pennsylvania · 88, 96  
 Pentagon, the · 12, 48, 91, 92, 95  
 people · 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14,  
     18, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33,  
     34, 39, 40, 42, 45, 48, 49, 50, 51,  
     52, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63,  
     65, 66, 67, 71, 72, 74, 75, 78, 79,  
     80, 82, 83, 84, 88, 89, 91, 95, 96,  
     97, 98, 100, 101, 105, 106, 107,  
     108  
 Philippines · 96  
 philosophies · 52  
 philosophy · 34, 35, 52, 70, 71, 72  
 polarized · 43, 48, 49  
 police · 6, 17, 36, 40, 84, 90  
 political · 7, 9, 13, 16, 22, 24, 26, 27,  
     28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 40,  
     41, 42, 44, 48, 49, 50, 55, 58, 60,  
     70, 71, 79, 82, 83, 84, 104, 107  
 political theory · 7, 26  
 political violence · 32, 33, 34, 36,  
     70, 79  
 politicians · 13, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27,  
     28, 29, 42, 43, 44, 51, 58, 59, 60,  
     62  
 posterity · 84

power · 24, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 40, 70  
 president · 12, 16, 18, 20, 44, 54, 59  
 principles · 9, 11, 12, 30, 34, 49, 70, 71  
 private · 6, 7, 8, 11, 17, 26, 34, 40, 45, 70, 84  
 problems · 35, 44, 46, 80  
 Pro-choice · 105  
 propaganda · 41  
 property · 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 26, 34, 40, 49, 70, 71, 72, 101  
 prophets · 64  
 protection · 12, 40, 52, 75  
 protest · 7, 13, 24, 82  
 protester · 82

---

**R**

radical · 49, 105  
 radicalized · 104, 105  
 radio · 58  
 reason · 7, 13, 19, 26, 52, 54, 56, 60, 90, 91, 104, 106  
 rebellion · 41  
 regime · 13, 33, 39, 41, 43, 79, 104, 105  
 religious · 107  
 repent · 61, 64, 80  
 repression · 36  
 Republicans · 28, 35, 105  
 revolution · 6, 7, 9, 34, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 52, 70, 71, 72, 105  
 revolutionaries · 105  
 revolutionary · 6, 7, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 48, 70, 71, 104, 105  
 Revolutionary War · 70  
 rich · 29, 39  
 right to life · 55  
 righteousness · 66, 85  
 rights · 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 24, 29, 36, 39, 40, 42, 49, 50, 52, 55, 56, 71, 72, 82  
 Roe v. Wade · 20, 54, 55, 64  
 rural · 18, 42

Russia · 6, 12, 22, 23, 32, 33, 62

---

**S**

Sabine, George H. · 7, 26  
 safety · 10, 12, 13, 24, 30, 45, 60  
 San Diego, California · 97  
 scenario · 23, 38, 74  
 Seal, Barry · 18, 19, 20  
 seals · 34, 70  
 security · 10, 17, 24, 36, 51  
 sedition · 41  
 self-centered · 106, 108  
 selfish · 106, 108  
 September 11, 2001 · 20, 89, 92, 97  
 settlers · 74  
 sewers · 64, 107, 108  
 shameful · 24, 82, 84, 102  
 Shiite · 95  
 sin · 66, 67, 101, 102  
 slaughter · 63, 67  
 social · 7, 35, 48, 49, 71, 72, 107  
 Social Security · 24  
 socialistic · 52  
 Socialists · 105  
 society · 43, 48, 49, 52, 105  
 solution · 13, 24, 35, 39, 40, 41, 48  
 songs · 34, 70  
 soul · 7, 26, 46, 53, 63, 84  
 Spanish American War · 70  
 Special Forces, U. S. · 90, 91  
 spirit · 85, 104  
 Stinnett, Robert · 91  
 suffering · 11, 12, 14, 74, 106  
 Sunni · 78, 95  
 support · 22, 23, 24, 38, 39, 44, 45, 46, 50, 59, 62, 63, 64, 67, 72, 74, 76, 79, 80, 90  
 surveillance · 36, 95  
 symbolism · 34, 70, 71

---

**T**

taxpayer · 26  
 television · 50, 59, 60, 91, 107  
 temple · 64, 100, 101, 102  
 term limits · 27, 44  
 terror attacks · 94  
 terrorism · 32, 35, 58, 59, 74, 75, 78,  
     79, 104  
 terrorist attacks · 12, 90, 94, 97  
 terrorists · 12, 34, 59, 74, 88, 90, 95,  
     104, 105  
 Tiller, George (a.k.a. "Tiller the  
     Killer") · 83, 84  
 torture · 12, 33  
 totalitarian · 36  
 trade · 18, 46, 83, 100  
 traditional · 6, 8, 34, 49, 70, 82  
 trafficking · 16, 20  
 treason · 41  
 troops · 24, 43, 90, 108  
 truth · 19, 38, 39, 45, 48, 52, 54, 63,  
     64, 71, 74, 78, 79, 85, 91, 94, 97,  
     105  
 TWA flight 800 · 88, 89, 96  
 tyranny · 7, 14, 26, 40

---

**U**

U. S. · 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20,  
     23, 24, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38,  
     39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 49, 52, 54, 55,  
     59, 62, 63, 67, 70, 71, 72, 74, 79,  
     80, 88, 89, 90, 94, 95, 96, 97, 107,  
     108  
 U. S. Constitution · 10, 33, 35, 41,  
     44, 52, 55, 72  
 U. S. Supreme Court · 20, 54, 55  
 unemployment · 28  
 United Nations · 62, 74  
 United States · 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12,  
     13, 22, 26, 40, 50, 54, 59, 70, 74,  
     76, 90  
 University of Arkansas · 54

---

University of Chicago · 56  
 urban · 42

---

**V**

vengeance · 67, 85  
 violence · 32, 33, 35, 40, 41, 42, 48,  
     49, 79, 82, 83, 84, 85, 100, 101  
 violent act · 35, 101

---

**W**

Wal-Mart · 55  
 war · 11, 12, 13, 22, 23, 34, 38, 40,  
     41, 43, 51, 58, 59, 62, 78, 82, 90,  
     105, 111  
 War on Terror · 12, 13, 38, 59, 89,  
     90  
 Washington · 10, 13, 16, 18, 20, 22,  
     23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 39, 40, 41,  
     42, 44, 45, 46, 50, 51, 58, 59, 60,  
     61, 62, 63, 64, 90, 91, 92, 104,  
     105  
 Washington politics · 59  
 water · 62, 107, 108  
 weapons · 18, 19, 24, 62, 108  
 wicked · 67, 84  
 women · 12, 33, 54, 56, 79  
 work · 24, 28, 39, 41, 44, 45, 49, 52,  
     63, 66  
 working poor · 28  
 world · 8, 24, 25, 32, 33, 45, 59, 62,  
     64, 80, 90, 91, 92, 102, 105, 106,  
     107, 108  
 World Trade Center · 12, 89, 95  
 World War II · 79, 91  
 World War III · 13, 23, 38, 59, 60,  
     62  
 worldviews · 107

---

**Y**

Yousef, Ramzi · 89, 95, 96, 97

---

**Z**

Zion · 85

Zionist · 34, 39, 74, 75, 79



This book is a compilation of social and political essays which call for massive, non-violent demonstrations in Washington—made by *the People*—in order to get the real change we so desperately need in America: an end to wars, and end to torture, an end to spying on Americans, an end to assassinating Americans suspected of being terrorists, an end to the suspension of due process of law for Americans suspected of being terrorists, an end to U. S. support of Israel, and an end to the Washington government's cover-up of the 9/11 attacks.

The author, A. J. MacDonald, Jr., is a thinker, writer, social critic, and activist. A layperson in the Catholic Church, he is also the author of *The World Perceived: A Theological and Phenomenological Approach to Thinking, Perceiving, and Living In-The-World* (2009). He currently resides in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.

[theworldperceived.blogspot.com](http://theworldperceived.blogspot.com)

[ajmacdonaldjr@gmail.com](mailto:ajmacdonaldjr@gmail.com)

facebook: [AJ MacDonald Jr](https://www.facebook.com/AJMacDonaldJr)

